arXiv:1612.07283v1 [math.AP] 21 Dec 2016

Semilinear elliptic equations with Dirichlet operator and singular nonlinearities

Tomasz Klimsiak

Abstract

In the paper we consider elliptic equations of the form $-Au = u^{-\gamma}\cdot\mu$, where A is the operator associated with a regular symmetric Dirichlet form, μ is a positive nontrivial measure and $\gamma > 0$. We prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions of such equations as well as some regularity results. We also study stability of solutions with respect to the convergence of measures on the right-hand side of the equation. For this purpose, we introduce some type of functional convergence of smooth measures, which in fact is equivalent to the quasi-uniform convergence of associated potentials.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010), 35J75, 60J45.

1 Introduction

Let E be a separable locally compact metric space, $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ be a regular symmetric Dirichlet form on $L^2(E;m)$ and let μ be a nontrivial (i.e. $\mu(E) > 0$) positive Borel measure on E. In the present paper we study elliptic equations of the form

$$-Au = g(u)\cdot\mu, \quad u > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where A is the operator associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous function satisfying

$$c_1 \le g(u)\cdot u^{\gamma} \le c_2, \quad u > 0 \tag{1.2}$$

for some $c_1, c_2, \gamma > 0$. The model example of (1.1) is the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^{\alpha/2}u = u^{-\gamma}\cdot\mu, \quad u > 0, & \text{on } D,\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d\setminus D, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,2]$, $\gamma > 0$ and D is a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The paper consists of two parts. In the first part we address the problem of existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions of (1.1). In the second part we study stability of solutions of (1.1) with respect to the convergence of measures on the right-hand side of the equation. The above problems were treated in [4] in case $A = \Delta$ and

T. Klimsiak: Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Śniadeckich 8, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland, and Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Chopina 12/18, 87-100 Toruń, Poland.

e-mail: tomas@mat.umk.pl; tel.: +48 566112951; fax: +48 56 6112987.

[3] in case A is a uniformy elliptic divergence form operator. Some different but related problems are studied in [21] in case A is a Leray-Lions type operator. The main aim of the present paper is to generalize the results of [3, 4] to equations with general (possibly nonlocal) operators corresponding to symmetric Dirichlet forms. We also refine some results proved in [3, 4, 21] for equations with local operators.

In the first part of the paper (Sections 3 and 4) we assume that μ belongs to the class $\mathcal{R}$ of smooth (with respect to capacity associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$) positive Borel measures on E whose potential is m-a.e. finite (see Section 2 for details). It is known (see [16, Proposition 5.13]) that $\mathcal{M}_{0,b} \subset \mathcal{R}$, where $\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ is the class of bounded smooth measures on E. In general, the inclusion is strict. For instance, in case of (1.3), $\mathcal{R}$ includes smooth Radon measures μ such that $\int_D \delta^{\alpha/2}(x)\,\mu(dx) < \infty$, where $\delta(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial D)$ (see [14, Example 5.2]).

The first difficulty we encounter when considering equation (1.1) is to define properly a solution. Here we give a probabilistic definition of a solution of (1.1) via the Feynman-Kac formula. Namely, by a solution of (1.1) we mean a quasi-continuous function u on E such that $u > 0$ quasi-everywhere (q.e. for short) with respect to the capacity Cap naturally associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ and for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta g(u)(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu.$$

Here $\{(X_t)_{t\geq 0}, (P_x)_{x\in E}\}$ is a Hunt process with life time ζ associated with the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$, E_x is the expectation with respect to P_x and A^μ is the positive continuous additive functional in the Revuz correspondence with μ.

One reason for adopting here the probabilistic definition of a solution is that unlike problem (1.3), for general A one can not expect that $\inf_{x\in K} u(x) > 0$ for every compact $K \subset E$. Therefore the variational definition of a solution considered in [3] is not (at least directly) applicable to general equations of the form (1.1), because we do not know whether $g(u) \cdot \mu$ is a Radon measure. The probabilistic approach allows one to overcome the difficulty. Another advantage lies in the fact that it allows one to cope with the uniqueness problem.

In Section 3 we prove several results on existence and uniqueness of solutions of (1.1) and its generalization (equation with mixed nonlinearities). It is worth pointing out that the rather delicate problem of uniqueness (see [23]) was not addressed in [3].

Regularity of solutions of (1.1) is studied in Section 4. First, in Proposition 4.5, we generalize some result proved in [18], and then we use this generalization to prove that if μ is bounded then for every $\gamma > 0$ the function $u^{(\gamma+1)/2}$ belongs to the extended Dirichlet space $D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and there exists $c(\gamma) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(u^{(\gamma+1)/2}, u^{(\gamma+1)/2}) \leq c(\gamma) c_2 \|\mu\|_{TV},$$

where $\|\mu\|_{TV}$ denotes the total variation norm of μ. In case of (1.3) the above inequality gives the estimate of $u^{(\gamma+1)/2}$ in the norm of the fractional Sobolev space $H_0^{\alpha/2}(D)$.

In the second part of the paper (Sections 5–7), we study stability of solutions u_n of the problems

$$-Au_n = g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n, \quad u_n > 0 \tag{1.4}$$

under different assumptions on the type of convergence of measures μ_n and the limit measure μ. We always assume that $\{\mu_n\}$ is a sequence of smooth nontrivial Borel measures on E such that $\sup_{n\geq 1}\|\mu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$. As for μ, we distinguish two cases: $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$, i.e. μ is bounded and smooth, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$, i.e. μ is a general bounded Borel measure on E.

In Section 5 we start with the study of the general case $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$. Our main result (Theorem 5.4) says that if $\mu_n \to \mu$ vaguely then the sequence $\{\nu_n := g(u_n)\cdot\mu_n\}$ is tight in the vague topology and its every limit point is a smooth measure. Moreover, if $\nu_n \to \nu$ vaguely, then, up to a subsequence, $u_n \to u$ m-a.e., where $-Au = \nu$.

In Section 6 we address the case $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$. We first introduce some type of convergence of smooth measures, which is stronger then the vague and the narrow convergence. At the same time, it is weaker then the convergence in the variation norm, but nevertheless it preserves the smoothness property. This new concept of convergence of $\{\mu_n\}$ to μ is defined via some sort of uniform convergence of the sequence of additive functionals $\{A^{\mu_n}\}$ to A^{μ}, so we denote it by $\xrightarrow{uAF}$. We prove (see Proposition 4.3, Proposition 6.1) that, up to a subsequence, the convergence $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ is equivalent to the quasi-uniform convergence of $\{u_n\}$ to u, where u_n, u are solutions of the problems

$$-Au_n = \mu_n, \qquad -Au = \mu, \tag{1.5}$$

respectively. Therefore it is possible to define the convergence $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ analytically without recourse to the notion of additive functional from the probabilistic potential theory. Note that this analytical characterization of the convergence $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ may be viewed as a significant generalization of the stability result proved in [4]. Our main theorem on stability of (1.4) (Theorem 6.3) says that if $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ then (up to a subsequence) $u_n \to u$ q.e., where u is a solution of (1.1). We also show (see Proposition 6.7) that if $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ then $\{\mu_n\}$ is locally equidiffuse, which again confirms the usefulness of our new notion of the convergence of measures.

In Section 7 we return to the case of general measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$ but we assume that $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and μ is approximated by mollification, i.e. $\mu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu$, where $j_{1/n}$ is a mollifier. In our main result we also restrict our attention to a class of operators including $\Delta^{\alpha/2}$, $\alpha \in (0,2]$, as a special case. It is known that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$ admits a unique decomposition

$$\mu = \mu_c + \mu_d$$

into the singular part μ_c with respect to Cap (the so-called concentrated part) and an absolutely continuous part μ_d with respect to Cap (the so-called diffuse part). The case $\mu_c = 0$ is covered by results of Section 6, because we show that $j_{1/n} * \mu_d \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu_d$. The case $\mu_c \neq 0$ is much more involved, but can be handled by combining the results of Section 5 with those of Section 6. Before describing our main result, we first make some comments on the simplest case $A = \Delta$.

If $A = \Delta$ then from the inverse maximum principle (see [8]) one can deduce that the singular part μ_c (with respect to the Newtonian capacity cap_2) is responsible for explosions of the solution u of (1.1). When u explodes, $g(u)$ is formally equal to zero, so it seems that in (1.1) the absorption term g forces some reduction of μ_c. Several natural question arise here. The first one is whether such reduction really occurs

and whether the whole singular part μ_c is reduced? Another question is whether in investigating (1.3) one should consider the Newtonian capacity cap_2, or, maybe, it is better to consider other capacities (for example p-capacities)? What happens if Δ is replaced by a general Dirichlet operator A? In [3] partial answers to these questions are given in case $A = \Delta$. Let u_n be a solution of (1.4) with $A = \Delta$ and $\mu_n = g_n \cdot m$ with $\{g_n\} \subset L^\infty(D; m)$, where m is the Lebesgue measure on D. In [3] it is proved that if μ is orthogonal to cap_2, (1.2) is satisfied with $\gamma \geq 1$ and $\mu_n \to \mu$ in the narrow topology, then $u_n \to 0$. For $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ similar result is proved in case μ is orthogonal to the p-capacity with $p > 2$ being the Hölder conjugate to $q = \frac{d(\gamma+1)}{d-1+\gamma}$. Finally, let us mention that the same problem of reduction of the singular part of μ forced by absorption g is considered in [21] in case g is bounded and A is a Leray-Lions type operator (i.e. local operator).

In Theorem 7.3, the main result of Section 7, we prove that in fact g forces the reduction of the whole singular part μ_c of μ for every $\gamma > 0$. To be more specific, we prove that if u_n is a solution of (1.4) with $\mu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu$, then, up to a subsequence, $u_n \to u$ m-a.e., where

$$-Au = g(u) \cdot \mu_d, \quad u > 0.$$

The above result makes it legitimate to define solutions of (1.1) with bounded Borel measure μ as the solutions of (1.1) with μ replaced by μ_d. With this definition, Theorem 7.3 is the existence theorem for (1.1) with bounded Borel measure μ. Finally, note that $\mathrm{Cap} = \mathrm{cap}_2$ if $A = \Delta$ and that the capacity cap_2 is absolutely continuous with respect to the p-capacity for $p \geq 2$. Therefore in case $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ our result strengthens the corresponding result from [3]. It should be stressed, however, that in [3] more general approximations $\{\mu_n\}$ of μ are considered.

2 Preliminaries

In the paper E is a locally compact separable metric space and m is a positive Radon measure on E such that $\mathrm{Supp}[m] = E$. By $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ we denote a symmetric Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; m)$. Recall that this means that

($\mathcal{E}$.1) $\mathcal{E} : D[\mathcal{E}] \times D[\mathcal{E}] \to \mathbb{R}$, where $D[\mathcal{E}]$ is a dense linear subspace of $L^2(E; m)$,

($\mathcal{E}$.2) $\mathcal{E}$ is bilinear, $\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \mathcal{E}(v, u)$ and $\mathcal{E}(u, u) \geq 0$, $u, v \in D[\mathcal{E}]$,

($\mathcal{E}$.3) $\mathcal{E}$ is closed, i.e. $D[\mathcal{E}]$ equipped with the inner product generated by the form $\mathcal{E}_1$ is a Hilbert space (Here, as usual, for $\alpha > 0$ we set $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(u, v) = \mathcal{E}(u, v) + \alpha(u, v)$, $u, v \in D[\mathcal{E}]$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the usual inner product in $L^2(E; m)$),

($\mathcal{E}$.4) $\mathcal{E}$ is Markovian, i.e. if $u \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ then $v := (0 \vee u) \wedge 1 \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ and $\mathcal{E}(v, v) \leq \mathcal{E}(u, u)$.

By Riesz's theorem, for every $\alpha > 0$ and $f \in L^2(E; m)$ there exists a unique function $G_\alpha f \in L^2(E; m)$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha(G_\alpha f, g) = (f, g), \quad g \in L^2(E; m).$$

It is an elementary check that $\{G_\alpha,\ \alpha > 0\}$ is a strongly continuous contraction resolvent on $L^2(E; m)$. By $\{T_t,\ t \geq 0\}$ we denote the associated semigroup and by $(A, D(A))$

the operator generated by $\{T_t\}$. It is well known (see [9, Section 1.3]) that $D(A) \subset D[\mathcal{E}]$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(u,v) = (-Au, v), \quad u \in D(A), v \in D[\mathcal{E}].$$

In the whole paper we assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is regular and transient, i.e.

($\mathcal{E}$.5) (regularity) the space $D[\mathcal{E}] \cap C_0(E)$ is dense in $D[\mathcal{E}]$ with respect to the $\mathcal{E}_1$-norm and in $C_0(E)$ with respect to the supremum norm,

($\mathcal{E}$.6) (transience) there exists a strictly positive function g on E such that

$$\int_E |u(x)|g(x)\, m(dx) \le \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}}, \quad u \in D[\mathcal{E}].$$

where

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(u,u)}, \quad u \in D[\mathcal{E}].$$

In the whole paper we fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$ such that $\varphi > 0$, $\int_E \varphi\, dm = 1$, and we put $h = G_1\varphi$, $\pi = \varphi \cdot m$.

Given a Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ we define the capacity Cap: $2^E \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as follows: for an open $U \subset E$ we set

$$\mathrm{Cap}(U) = \mathcal{E}_1(h_U, h_U),$$

where h_U is the reduced function of h on U (see [19, Chapter III]), and for arbitrary $A \subset E$ we set

$$\mathrm{Cap}(A) = \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}(U); A \subset U \subset E,\ U \text{ open}\}.$$

An increasing sequence $\{F_n\}$ of closed subsets of E is called nest if $\mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus F_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. A subset $N \subset E$ is called exceptional if $\mathrm{Cap}(N) = 0$. We say that some property P holds quasi everywhere (q.e. for short) if a set for which it does not hold is exceptional.

We say that a function u defined q.e. on E is quasi-continuous if there exists a nest $\{F_n\}$ such that $u_{|F_n}$ is continuous for every $n \ge 1$. It is known that each function $u \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ has a quasi-continuous m-version. From now on for $u \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ we always consider its quasi-continuous version.

A Borel measure μ on E is called smooth if it does not charge exceptional sets and there exists a nest $\{F_n\}$ such that $|\mu|(F_n) < \infty$, $n \ge 1$. By S we denote the set of all positive smooth measures on E.

In the paper we also use the capacity CAP considered in [9, Chapter 2]. We would like to stress that the notions of exceptional sets, quasi-continuity and smooth measures defined with respect to Cap and with respect to CAP are equivalent. Therefore in the paper we may use the results of [9, 19] interchangeably.

By $S_0^{(0)}$ we denote the set of all measures $\mu \in S$ for which there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\int_E |u|\, d\mu \le c\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(u,u)}, \quad u \in D[\mathcal{E}], \tag{2.1}$$

For a given Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ one can always define the so-called extended Dirichlet space $D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ as the set of m-measurable functions on E for which there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-Cauchy sequence $\{u_n\} \subset D[\mathcal{E}]$ convergent m-a.e. to u (the so-called approximating

sequence). One can show that for $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ the limit $\mathcal{E}(u,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}(u_n,u_n)$ exists and does not depend on the approximating sequence $\{u_n\}$ for u. Each element $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ has a quasi-continuous version. It is known that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is transient iff the pair $(\mathcal{E}, D_e[\mathcal{E}])$ is a Hilbert space. In the latter case for a given measure $\mu \in S_0^{(0)}$ inequality (2.1) holds for every $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$.

In the sequel we say that $u : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable if it is universally measurable, i.e. measurable with respect to the σ-algebra

$$\mathcal{B}^*(E) = \bigcap_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(E)} \mathcal{B}^\mu(E),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is the set of all probability measures on E and $\mathcal{B}^\mu(E)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}(E)$ with respect to the measure μ.

By $\mathcal{M}_b$ we denote the set of all bounded Borel measures on E and by $\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ the subset of $\mathcal{M}_b$ consisting of smooth measures. We say that a positive Borel measure μ on E is nontrivial if $\mu(E) > 0$.

Given a Borel measurable function η on E and a Borel measure μ on E we write

$$(\eta, \mu) = \int_E \eta \, d\mu.$$

By $u \cdot \mu$ w denote the Borel measure on E defined as

$$(f, u \cdot \mu) = (f \cdot u, \mu), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}(E)$$

whenever the integrals exist.

Let us recall that for given measurable spaces $(S,\mathcal{S})$, $(T,\mathcal{T})$ a function $\kappa : S \times \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is called a kernel (from S to $\mathcal{T}$) if for every $B \in \mathcal{T}$ the mapping $S \ni s \mapsto \kappa(s,B)$ is $\mathcal{S}$ measurable and for every fixed s the mapping $\mathcal{T} \ni B \mapsto \kappa(s,B)$ is a measure. Let us also recall that for given measure μ on $\mathcal{S}$ and kernel κ from S to $\mathcal{T}$ one can consider its product $\mu \otimes \kappa$, which by definition is a measure on $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{T}$ defined as

$$(\mu \otimes \kappa)(f) = \int_S \int_T f(s,t)\, \kappa(s, dt)\, \mu(ds).$$

With a regular symmetric Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ one can associate uniquely a Hunt process $\mathbb{X} = ((X_t)_{,t\geq 0}, (P_x)_{x\in E}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \zeta)$ (see [9]). It is related to $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ by the formula

$$T_t f(x) = E_x f(X_t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad m\text{-a.e.},$$

where E_x stands for the expectation with respect to the measure P_x. For $\alpha, t \geq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}^+(E)$ we write

$$R_\alpha f(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\alpha t} f(X_t)\, dt, \quad p_t f(x) = E_x f(X_t), \quad x \in E.$$

It is well known (see [9, Section 5.1] that for each $\mu \in S$ there exists a unique positive continuous additive functional A^μ in the Revuz duality with μ. For $\mu \in S$ we write

$$(R_\alpha \mu)(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\alpha t}\, dA_t^\mu, \quad x \in E$$

For simplicity we denote R_0 by R.

By $S_{00}^{(0)}$ we denote the set of all $\mu \in S_0^{(0)}$ such that $\mu(E) < \infty$ and $R\mu$ is bounded. We set

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\mu \in S : R\mu < \infty \text{ q.e.}\}.$$

It is known (see [16, Lemma 4.3, Proposition 5.13]) that if $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is transient then $\mathcal{M}_{0,b}^{+} \subset \mathcal{R}$. Note that by [16, Lemma 4.3], if $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ then the function $R\mu$ is quasi-continuous. For an equivalent definition of the class $\mathcal{R}$ see remarks following [17, Lemma 3.1].

For a Borel set B we set

$$\sigma_B = \inf\{t > 0; X_t \in B\}, \quad D_A = \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t \in B\}, \quad \tau_B = \sigma_{E\setminus B},$$

i.e. σ_B is the first hitting time of B, D_A is the first debut time of B and τ_B is the first exit time of B.

By B^r we denote the set of regular points for B, i.e.

$$B^r = \{x \in E; P_x(\sigma_B > 0) = 0\}.$$

By $\mathcal{T}$ we denote the set of all stopping times with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and by $\mathbf{D}$ the set of all measurable functions u on E for which the family

$$\{u(X_\tau),\, \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$$

is uniformly integrable with respect to the measure P_x for q.e. $x \in E$.

For a Borel measure μ on E and $\alpha \geq 0$ by $\mu \circ R_\alpha$ we denote the measure defined as

$$(f, \mu \circ R_\alpha) = (R_\alpha f, \mu), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}(E)$$

and by P_μ the measure

$$P_\mu(A) = \int_E P_x(A)\, \mu(dx), \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty.$$

Finally, let us recall that a positive measurable function u on E is called excessive if

$$p_t u \leq u, \quad t \geq 0,$$

and u is called potential if it is excessive and for every sequence $\{T_n\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that $T_n \nearrow T \geq \zeta$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_x u(X_{T_n}) = 0.$$

for q.e. $x \in E$.

3 Existence and uniqueness of solutions

Let us recall that in the whole paper we assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.1)$–$(\mathcal{E}.6)$. As for μ and g, unless otherwise stated, in the paper we assume that $\mu \in S$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous function satisfying (1.2). We also adopt the convention that $g(0) = +\infty$, $g(+\infty) = 0$.

Remark 3.1. The class of forms satisfying ($\mathcal{E}$.1)–($\mathcal{E}$.6) is quite wide. For instance, it includes forms generated by divergence form operators considered in [3], i.e. operators of the form

$$Au(x) = \operatorname{div}(a(x)\nabla u(x)), \quad x \in D,$$

where D is a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a is a symmetric bounded uniformly elliptic d-dimensional matrix. A model example of nonlocal operator associated with form satisfying ($\mathcal{E}$.1)–($\mathcal{E}$.6) is the fractional Laplacian $\Delta^{\alpha/2}$ on D with $\alpha \in (0,2)$. For the above and some other interesting examples see, e.g., [9, Chapter 1].

Definition. We say that a measurable function $u : E \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a solution of (1.1) if

(a) u is quasi-continuous and $0 < u(x) < \infty$ q.e.,

(b) for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta g(u(X_t))\, dA_t^\mu. \tag{3.1}$$

We will need the following hypothesis:

(H) $g : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is nonincreasing.

3.1 Existence and uniqueness of solutions of (1.1)

We begin with a comparison and uniqueness result.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that μ_1, μ_2 are smooth measures such that $0 \le \mu_1 \le \mu_2$ and $g_1, g_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ are measurable functions such that $g_1(y) \le g_2(y)$ for $y > 0$. Moreover, assume that either g_1 or g_2 satisfies* (H). *If u_1 is a solution of* (1.1) *with data g_1, μ_1 and u_2 is a solution of* (1.1) *with data g_2, μ_2 then $u_1 \le u_2$ q.e.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that g_2 is nonincreasing. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula, for q.e. $x \in E$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(u_1 - u_2)^+(x) &\le E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1-u_2>0\}}(X_t)(g_1(u_1)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_1} - g_2(u_2)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_2}) \\
&= E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1-u_2>0\}}(X_t) g_1(u_1)(X_t)\, d(A_t^{\mu_1} - A_t^{\mu_2}) \\
&\quad + E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1-u_2>0\}}(X_t)(g_1(u_1) - g_2(u_1))(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_2} \\
&\quad + E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1-u_2>0\}}(X_t)(g_2(u_1) - g_2(u_2))(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_1 \le \mu_2$, $dA^{\mu_1} \le dA^{\mu_2}$ under P_x for q.e. $x \in E$ by the properties of the Revuz duality. Therefore the first integral on the right-hand side of the above equality is nonpositive. The second one is nonpositive since $g_1 \le g_2$ and $\mu_2 \ge 0$. Finally, the third term is nonpositive due to the fact that g_2 is nonincreasing and $\mu_2 \ge 0$. Hence $(u_1 - u_2)^+(x) = 0$ for q.e. $x \in E$, which implies that $u_1 \le u_2$ q.e. □

Corollary 3.3. *Assume that $\mu \in S$ and g satisfies* (H). *Then there exists at most one solution of* (1.1).

In what follows we will also need the following two hypotheses. The first one was introduced by P.A. Meyer and is called Meyer's hypothesis (L).

(L) For some (and hence for every) $\alpha > 0$, $\delta_{\{x\}} \circ R_\alpha \ll m$ for every $x \in E$, where $\delta_{\{x\}}$ is the Dirac measure on E concentrated at x.

($\mathcal{E}$.7) For every nearly Borel set B such that $\mathrm{Cap}(B) > 0$, $P_x(\sigma_B < \infty) > 0$ for q.e. $x \in E$.

Remark 3.4. (i) Hypothesis (L) is satisfied if there exists a Borel measurable function $r_\alpha : E \times E \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for every $f \in L^2(E; m)$,

$$R_\alpha f = \int_E f(y) r_\alpha(\cdot, y)\, m(dy), \quad m\text{-a.e.}$$

It therefore clear that operators from Remark 3.1 satisfy (L).

(ii) Hypothesis (L) is also called "absolute continuity condition". For equivalents for this property see [9, Theorems 4.1.2, 4.2.4].

Remark 3.5. Observe that if ($\mathcal{E}$.7) is satisfied then $R\mu > 0$ q.e. for every nontrivial $\mu \in S$. Indeed, let F be a quasi support of A^μ. Then by [9, Theorem 5.1.5] it is also a quasi support of μ. Since μ is nontrivial, $\mathrm{Cap}(F) > 0$. Therefore by ($\mathcal{E}$.7), $P_x(\sigma_F < \zeta) > 0$ q.e. Since F is a quasi support of A^μ, $E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu > 0$ for q.e. $x \in F$. Hence for q.e. $x \in E$ we have

$$0 < E_x E_{X_{\sigma_F}} \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu \le R\mu(x).$$

Remark 3.6. (i) It is known that ($\mathcal{E}$.7) is satisfied if the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is irreducible (see [9, Theorem 4.7.1]).

(ii) ($\mathcal{E}$.7) is satisfied if the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypothesis (L) and $r_\alpha(\cdot,\cdot)$ defined as $r_\alpha(x,\cdot) \cdot m = \delta_{\{x\}} \circ R_\alpha$ is strictly positive. Indeed, let F be a closed set such that $\mathrm{Cap}(F) > 0$. Then

$$0 < \int_E r_\alpha(x, y)\, d\mu_F(y) = R_\alpha \mu_F(x) = e_F^\alpha(x) = E_x e^{-\alpha\sigma_F}, \tag{3.2}$$

where μ_F is the smooth measure associated with the equilibrium e_F (see [9, Theorem 2.1.5]). The first inequality in (3.2) follows from the fact that μ_F is nontrivial (since $\mathrm{Cap}(F) > 0$) and $r_\alpha(\cdot,\cdot)$ is strictly positive. By (3.2) we have $P_x(\sigma_F < \infty) > 0$ for q.e. $x \in E$.

(iii) From (ii) and Remark 3.5 it follows that the operators from Remark 3.1 satisfy ($\mathcal{E}$.7).

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is continuous and bounded. Then if g is nonincreasing or $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypotheses* (L) *then there exists a solution of the equation*

$$-Au = g(u) \cdot \mu. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, if μ is nontrivial, g is strictly positive and ($\mathcal{E}$.7) *is satisfied then $u > 0$ q.e.*

Proof. First let us assume that $\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. Let us put $V = (D_e[\mathcal{E}], \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}})$ and define $\Phi : V \to V$, $\mathcal{A} : V \to V'$ by

$$\Phi(u) = R(g(u)\cdot\mu), \quad \mathcal{A}u = -Au - g(u)\cdot\mu, \quad u \in V.$$

That $\Phi(u) \in V$ follows from the fact that $S_{00}^{(0)} \subset S_0^{(0)}$ and $R(S_0^{(0)}) \subset D_e[\mathcal{E}]$, while the fact that $\mathcal{A}u \in V'$ is a consequence of the inclusion $S_0^{(0)} \subset V'$. Now we will show some properties of the mappings $\mathcal{A}$, Φ. If g is nonincreasing then

$$\langle \mathcal{A}u - \mathcal{A}v, u - v\rangle = \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{E}} - ((g(u) - g(v))\cdot\mu, u - v) \geq \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{E}}, \quad u, v \in V,$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the duality pairing between V and V'. Thus $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly monotone, hence coercive. It is also clear that $\mathcal{A}$ is hemicontinuous and bounded. As for Φ, let us first observe that $\|\Phi(u)\|_\infty \leq \|g\|_\infty \|R\mu\|_\infty$, $u \in V$. Moreover, Φ is continuous. Indeed, let $u_n \to u$ and let $v_n = \Phi(u_n)$, $v = \Phi(u)$. Then

$$\|v - v_n\|_{\mathcal{E}} = (v - v_n, (g(u) - g(u_n))\cdot\mu) \leq 2\|R\mu\|_\infty \|g\|_\infty \int_E |g(u) - g(u_n)|\, d\mu.$$

Since $u_n \to u$ in $\mathcal{E}$, there exists a subsequence $(n') \subset (n)$ such that $u_{n'} \to u$ q.e. (see [9, Theorem 2.1.4]). From this and the above inequality it follows that $v_{n'} \to v$ in $\mathcal{E}$. The above argument shows that for every subsequence $(n') \subset (n)$ there exists a further subsequence $(n'') \subset (n')$ such that $v_{n''} \to v$ in $\mathcal{E}$, which implies that $v_n \to v$ in $\mathcal{E}$. Also observe that if $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypothesis (L), then Φ is compact. Indeed, let $\{u_n\} \subset V$. Then

$$|v_n(x) - p_t v_n(x)| \leq \|g\|_\infty E_x \int_0^t dA_r^\mu, \quad t \geq 0 \tag{3.4}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By [15, Theorem 2.2, Proposition 2.4] there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{v_n\}$ is convergent q.e. Let $v = \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n$. Then

$$\|v - v_n\|_{\mathcal{E}} = (v - v_n, (g(u) - g(u_n))\cdot\mu) \leq 2\|g\|_\infty \int_E |v - v_n|\, d\mu,$$

which converges to zero as $n \to \infty$. Now we may conclude the existence result. In case g is nonincreasing the existence of a solution of (3.3) follows from [25, Corollary II.2.2]. If $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypotheses (L) then the existence follows by the Schauder fixed point theorem.

Now we turn to the the general case where $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$. There exists a nest $\{F_n\}$ such that $\mathbf{1}_{F_n}\cdot\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$, $n \geq 1$ (see [9, Section 2.2]). By what has already been proved, for each $n \geq 1$ there exists a solution $u_n \in V$ of the equation

$$-Au_n = g(u_n)\cdot\mu_n.$$

By the definition of a solution,

$$u_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta g(u_n)\mathbf{1}_{F_n}(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Since $\{F_n\}$ is a nest, $\mathbf{1}_{F_n}(X_t) \to 0$, $t \in [0, \zeta)$, P_x-a.s. for q.e. $x \in E$ (see [19, Proposition IV.5.30]). If g is nonincreasing then by Proposition 3.2 the sequence $\{u_n\}$ is nondecreasing. Therefore $u := \lim_{n\to\infty} u_n$ is a solution of (3.3). If $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypotheses (L) then by (3.4), which holds with v_n replaced by u_n, and by [15, Theorem 2.2, Propositions 2.4 and 4.3], there exists a subsequence $(n') \subset (n)$ such that $\{u_{n'}\}$ is convergent q.e. It is clear that $u := \lim_{n'\to\infty} u_{n'}$ is a solution of (3.3). The second assertion of the theorem follows immediately from the assumptions and Remark 3.5. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ and let u be defined as*

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu, \quad x \in E.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{CAP}(\{u > n\}) \to 0.$$

Proof. Let $A_n = \{u > n\}$. If $\sigma_{A_n} < \infty$ then $\sigma_{A_n} < \zeta$. Therefore by the Markov property and the fact that $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$, for q.e. $x \in E$ we have

$$P_x(\sigma_{A_n} < \infty) \le P_x(u(X_{\sigma_{A_n}\wedge\zeta}) \ge n) \le n^{-1} E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu,$$

which converges to zero as $n \to \infty$. Therefore applying [9, Corollary 4.3.1] we get the desired result. □

Theorem 3.9. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ is nontrivial and g satisfies* (H). *Then there exists a solution of* (1.1).

Proof. By Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.7, for every $n \ge 1$ there exists a unique solution u_n of the problem

$$-Au_n = g_n(u_n) \cdot \mu, \quad u_n > 0 \tag{3.5}$$

with $g_n(u) = g(u + \frac{1}{n})$, $u > 0$ and $g_n(u) = g(\frac{1}{n})$, $u \le 0$. By Proposition 3.2, $\{u_n\}$ is nondecreasing. Hence $u_1 \le u_n$ for $n \ge 1$. Since $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$ and μ is nontrivial, $u_1 > 0$ q.e. Hence $u_n > u_1 > 0$, $n \ge 1$ q.e. Put $u = \limsup_{n\to\infty} u_n > 0$. Then $u > 0$ q.e. By the definition of a solution of (3.5),

$$u_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta g_n(u_n(X_t))\, dA_t^\mu \tag{3.6}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula and (1.2),

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(x) \le (\gamma+1) E_x \int_0^\zeta g_n(u_n) u_n^\gamma(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu\cdot} \le (\gamma+1) c_2 E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu.$$

Hence

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(x) \le (\gamma+1) c_2 E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu < \infty$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. From the above inequality we conclude that u is a potential and $u \in \mathbf{D}$. Let $\tau_k = \tau_{G_k}$, $G_k = \{u_1 \geq k^{-1}\}$. Observe that for every $x \in G_k$,

$$g(u_n(x) + \frac{1}{n}) \leq g(u_1(x) + \frac{1}{n}) \leq \frac{c_2}{u_1^\gamma(x)} \leq c_2 k^\gamma.$$

Therefore by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

$$E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} g_n(u_n)(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu \to E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} g(u)(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu$$

as $n \to \infty$. Since for each $k \geq 1$,

$$u_n(x) = E_x u_n(X_{\tau_k}) + E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} g_n(u_n)(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, it follows that

$$u(x) = E_x u(X_{\tau_k}) + E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} g(u)(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Since u is a potential, from Lemma 3.8 and [9, Lemma 5.1.6] it follows that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \tau_k \geq \zeta$. Therefore letting $k \to \infty$ in the above equation we conclude that (3.1) is satisfied for q.e. $x \in E$. □

Theorem 3.10. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$ and Meyer's hypothesis* (L) *and that $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ is nontrivial. Then there exists a solution of* (1.1).

Proof. By Proposition 3.7, for every $n \geq 1$ there exists a solution u_n of (3.5) with $g_n(u) = g(u + \frac{1}{n})$ for $u > 0$. By (1.2) and Proposition 3.2,

$$v_n \leq u_n \leq w_n, \quad n \geq 1 \quad \text{q.e.},$$

where v_n, w_n are solutions of the problems

$$-Av_n = c_1(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} \cdot \mu, \quad v_n > 0, \qquad -Aw_n = c_2(w_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} \cdot \mu, \quad w_n > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Hence

$$g(u_n + \frac{1}{n}) \leq c_2(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} \leq c_2(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} \quad \text{q.e.}$$

Let v, w be solutions of the problems

$$-Av = c_1 v^{-\gamma} \cdot \mu, \quad v > 0, \qquad -Aw = c_2 w^{-\gamma} \cdot \mu, \quad w > 0.$$

From the proof of Theorem 3.9 it follows that $\{v_n\}$ converges q.e. to v. Hence

$$c_2(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}(X) \to c_2 v^{-\gamma}(X), \quad P_x \otimes dA^\mu\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, where $P_x \otimes dA^\mu$ is the product of the measure P_x and the kernel dA^μ from Ω to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Moreover,

$$v_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta c_2(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu \to E_x \int_0^\zeta c_2 v^{-\gamma}(X_t)\, dA_t^\mu = v(x)$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, which implies that the family $\{c_2(v_n(X)+\frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}\}$ is uniformly integrable with respect to the measure $P_x \otimes dA^\mu$ for q.e. $x \in E$. From this we conclude that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \sup_{n\geq 1} E_x \int_0^t g_n(u_n)(X_r)\, dA_r^\mu = 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \sup_{n\geq 1} |u_n(x) - p_t u_n(x)| = \lim_{t\to 0^+} \sup_{n\geq 1} E_x \int_0^t g_n(u_n)(X_r)\, dA_r^\mu = 0 \tag{3.8}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Since $u_n \leq w$ for $n \geq 1$, it follows from [15, Theorem 2.2, Propositions 2.4 and 4.3] that there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ converges q.e. The rest of the proof runs as the proof of Theorem 3.9. □

3.2 Existence and uniqueness of solutions with mixed nonlinearities

In this subsection we study problems of the form

$$-Au = (g(u) + h(u)) \cdot \mu, \quad u > 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Theorem 3.11. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ is nontrivial, g, h satisfy* (H) *and $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous function such that*

$$c_1 \leq h(s) \cdot s^\beta \leq c_2, \quad s > 0 \tag{3.10}$$

for some $\beta > 0$. Then there exists a unique solution u of problem (3.9)*. Moreover,*

$$u \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1}(2^\gamma v + 2^\beta w), \tag{3.11}$$

where v, w are solutions of the problems

$$-Av = c_1 v^{-\gamma} \cdot \mu, \quad v > 0, \qquad -Aw = c_1 w^{-\beta} \cdot \mu, \quad w > 0.$$

Proof. Uniqueness follows from Proposition 3.2. To prove the existence of solutions, let u_n denote the solution of the problem

$$-Au_n = (g_n(u_n) + h_n(u_n)) \cdot \mu, \quad u_n > 0 \tag{3.12}$$

with $g_n(u) = g(u + \frac{1}{n})$, $h_n(u) = h(u + \frac{1}{n})$ for $u > 0$. By Proposition 3.2, $\{u_n\}$ is nondecreasing and

$$v_n \leq u_n, \quad w_n \leq u_n \quad \text{q.e.}, \tag{3.13}$$

where v_n, w_n are solutions of (3.7). Therefore for each $n \geq 1$,

$$v_n + w_n \leq 2u_n \quad \text{q.e.}$$

By Proposition 3.2 the sequences $\{w_n\}, \{v_n\}$ are also nondecreasing. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} g(u_n + \frac{1}{n}) + h(u_n + \frac{1}{n}) &\leq c_2(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} + c_2(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\beta} \\ &\leq c_2(\frac{1}{2}w_n + \frac{1}{2}v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} + c_2(\frac{1}{2}w_n + \frac{1}{2}v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\beta} \\ &\leq c_2 2^\gamma (v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma} + c_2 2^\beta (w_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

From the proof of Theorem 3.9 it follows that the sequences $\{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}(X)\}$ and $\{(w_n + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}(X)\}$ are uniformly integrable with respect to the measure $P_x \otimes dA^\mu$. Let $u = \limsup_{n\to\infty} u_n$. By the definition of a solution of (3.12),

$$u_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta (g_n(u_n)(X_t) + h_n(u_n)(X_t))\, dA_t^\mu \tag{3.15}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By (3.14) the sequence $\{(g_n(u_n)(X) + h_n(u_n)(X)\}$ is uniformly integrable with respect to the measure $P_x \otimes dA^\mu$. Therefore letting $n \to \infty$ in (3.15) we get

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta (g(u)(X_t) + h(u)(X_t))\, dA_t^\mu.$$

Inequality (3.11) follows easily from (3.14.) □

Theorem 3.12. *Assume that* $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{E}.7)$ *and Meyer's hypothesis* (L)*,* $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ *is nontrivial and* $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *is a continuous function satisfying* (3.10) *for some* $\beta > 0$*. Then there exists a solution of* (3.9) *such that estimate* (3.11) *holds true.*

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 3.11 monotonicity of g, h was used only to prove q.e. convergence of $\{u_n\}$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.11 we show that the sequence $\{(g_n(u_n)(X)+h_n(u_n)(X)\}$ is uniformly integrable with respect to the measure $P_x \otimes dA^\mu$. Therefore (3.8) is satisfied, which when combined with [15, Theorem 2.2, Propositions 2.4 and 4.3] implies that $\{u_n\}$ has a subsequence convergent q.e. □

4 Regularity of solutions

Definition. We say that a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of measurable functions is convergent quasi-uniformly to a function u if for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{CAP}(\{|u_n - u| > \varepsilon\}) = 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Remark 4.1. Let $u, u_n, n \geq 1$, be quasi-continuous. Let us consider the following condition: for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_x(\sup_{t\geq 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)| > \varepsilon) = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

for m-a.e. $x \in E$. Condition (4.2) is equivalent to the quasi-uniform, up to a subsequence, convergence of $\{u_n\}$ to u. To see this, let us set $A_n^\varepsilon = \{|u_n - u| > \varepsilon\}$ and for arbitrary nearly Borel set $B \subset E$ put $p_B(x) = P_x(\sigma_B < \infty)$, $x \in E$. Assume that (4.2) holds. By the diagonal method there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $p_{B_n^\varepsilon}(x) \to 0$, m-a.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$, where $B_n^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{k\geq n} A_k^\varepsilon$. Hence, by [9, Corollary 4.3.1], $\mathrm{CAP}(B_n^\varepsilon) \to 0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, which implies that $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly. Now assume that $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly. Then by [9, Theorem 2.1.5], $\mathcal{E}(p_{A_n^\varepsilon}, p_{A_n^\varepsilon}) = \mathrm{CAP}(A_n^\varepsilon) \to 0$. Therefore, up to a subsequence, $p_{A_n^\varepsilon} \to 0$, m-a.e. Let us also mention that by the standard argument "m-a.e." in condition (4.2) may be replaced by "q.e."

Remark 4.2. Replacing CAP by Cap in (4.1) we get a notion of convergence which is weaker then the quasi-uniform convergence. In fact, if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}(\{|u_n - u| > \varepsilon\}) = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ then by [19, Lemma IV.4.5], $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly on every compact set $K \subset E$. Therefore the convergence defined by (4.3) may be called a locally quasi-uniform convergence.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mu, \mu_n \in \mathcal{R}$ and let $u = R\mu$, $u_n = R\mu_n$. If $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly then there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that for q.e. $x \in E$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_n} - A_t^{\mu}| = 0.$$

Proof. Since $u_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n} \to u(x)$, $\sup_{n\geq 1} E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n} < \infty$, which when combined with the quasi-uniform convergence of $\{u_n\}$ implies that $\{u_n(X)\}$ satisfies the condition UT under P_x for q.e. $x \in E$ (see [13, Proposition 3.2]). Therefore by [10, Theorem 1.8] (see also [13, Corollary 2.8]), for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_x(\sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_n} - A_t^{\mu}| > \varepsilon) = 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. This and the fact that $u_n \to u$, m-a.e. implies that the family $\{A_\zeta^{\mu_n}\}$ is uniformly integrable with respect to P_x for m-a.e. $x \in E$. Applying the Vitali theorem yields the desired result. □

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $\mu, \mu_n \in S_0^{(0)}$ and $\mu_n \to \mu$ strongly in $S_0^{(0)}$. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence of quasi-continuous functions such that $0 \leq u_n \leq c$ for some $c > 0$ and $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly. Then for every positive $\eta \in L^2(E; m)$ and every $\alpha > 0$,*

$$\int_E u_n R_\alpha \eta \, d\mu_n \to \int_E u R_\alpha \eta \, d\mu. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Since $\mu_n \to \mu$ in $S_0^{(0)}$, it is easy to see that $R\mu_n \to R\mu$ in the $\mathcal{E}$-norm. Therefore by [9, Lemma 5.1.1] there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $R\mu_n \to R\mu$ quasi-uniformly. By this and Proposition 4.3, $E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_n} - A_t^{\mu}| \to 0$ for q.e. $x \in E$. Consequently,

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\alpha t} u_n(X_t) \, dA_t^{\mu_n} \to E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\alpha t} u(X_t) \, dA_t^{\mu}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, so (4.4) follows by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem. □

The following proposition is a generalization of [18, Theorem 1].

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ and $u = R\mu$. If $\int_E u^{p-1} d\mu < \infty$ for some $p > 1$ then $u^{p/2} \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and there exists $c_p > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(u^{p/2}, u^{p/2}) \leq c_p (u^{p-1}, \mu).$$

Proof. Let $\theta \in D(A)$ be such that $0 \le \theta \le 1$ and $\theta \in L^1(E;m)$. Let us choose a nest $\{F_n\}$ such that $\mathbf{1}_{F_n} \cdot \mu$, $\mathbf{1}_{F_n} u^{p-1} \cdot \mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$, $n \ge 1$, and by $u_n(\cdot;\lambda,\theta,\alpha)$ denote a solution of

$$-A_\lambda u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha) = \theta\alpha R_\alpha \mu_n$$

with $\mu_n = \mathbf{1}_{F_n} \cdot \mu$, $\alpha > 0$ and $A_\lambda = A - \lambda I$, $\lambda > 0$. Observe that $\theta\alpha R_\alpha \mu_n \in L^2(E;m) \cap L^\infty(E;m)$. By [18, Theorem 1], $u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha) \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ and there exists $c_p > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha), u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)) \le c_p(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha), \theta\alpha R_\alpha \mu_n). \tag{4.5}$$

Let $u_n(\cdot;\lambda,\theta)$ be a solution of

$$-A_\lambda u_n(\lambda,\theta) = \theta \cdot \mu_n.$$

By the very definition of a solution,

$$u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha) = E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\lambda r} \Big(E_{X_r} \int_0^\zeta \alpha e^{-\alpha t}\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \Big) \theta(X_r)\, dr$$

and

$$u_n(x;\lambda,\theta) = E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\lambda t} \theta(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} = E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\lambda t} \theta(X_t) \mathbf{1}_{F_n}(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu} \tag{4.6}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore by the Markov property and Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha) &= E_x \int_0^\zeta e^{-\lambda r} \Big(E_x \int_r^\zeta \alpha e^{-\alpha(t-r)}\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \Big) \theta(X_r)\, dr \\ &= E_x \int_0^\zeta \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \Big(\int_0^t e^{(\alpha-\lambda)r} \theta(X_r)\, dr \Big) dA_t^{\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta \in D[\mathcal{E}]$, $t \mapsto \theta(X_t)$ is càdlàg. Therefore by standard calculations,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{(\alpha-\lambda)r} \theta(X_r)\, dr = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} \int_0^t \alpha e^{-\alpha(t-r)} e^{-\lambda r} \theta(X_r)\, dr = e^{-\lambda t} \theta(X_t)$$

and

$$\alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{(\alpha-\lambda)r} \theta(X_r)\, dr \le 2e^{-\lambda t}$$

for $\alpha \ge \lambda$. Therefore applying the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we get

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha) = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} u_n(x;\lambda,\theta)$$

for q.e $x \in E$. Observe that

$$\|u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)\|_\infty \le \|R\mu_n\|_\infty^{p-1} := c(n). \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, we have

$$u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha) \le R_\lambda(\alpha R_\alpha(\mu_n)) = \alpha R_\alpha(R_\lambda(\mu_n)) \le \alpha R_\alpha(\|R_\lambda \mu_n\|_\infty) \le \|R\mu_n\|_\infty.$$

From this and (4.5) it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha),u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)) \le c_p(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha),\theta\alpha R_\alpha(\mu_n)) \\ = c_p(\alpha R_\alpha(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)\cdot\theta),\mu) \le c_p c(n)\|\mu\|_{TV} \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha),u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)) \le \mathcal{E}_\lambda(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha),u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha)) \\ \le (u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha),\alpha R_\alpha\mu_n) \le c(n)^{1/(p-1)}\|\mu_n\|_{TV}. \tag{4.9}$$

Let us fix a sequence $\{\alpha_k\}\subset(0,\infty)$ such that $\alpha_k\nearrow\infty$ and set

$$S_k(u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k)) = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^k u_n(x;\lambda,\theta,\alpha_i).$$

By (4.9) and Mazur's theorem we may assume that $S_k(u_n(\cdot;\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))\to u_n(\cdot;\lambda,\theta)$ in $\mathcal{E}$. Therefore by [9, Lemma 5.1.1] and Remark 4.1 there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (k)) such that $S_k(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))\to u_n(\lambda,\theta)$ quasi-uniformly as $k\to\infty$. It is an elementary check that $\alpha_k R_{\alpha_k}(\mu_n)\to\mu_n$ weakly in $S_0^{(0)}$ as $k\to\infty$. So, again by Mazur's theorem we may assume that $S_k(\alpha_k R_{\alpha_k}\mu_n)\to\mu_n$ strongly in $S_0^{(0)}$. Therefore by Lemma 4.4, up to a subsequence we have

$$(S_k^{p-1}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))\cdot\theta, S_k(\alpha_k R_{\alpha_k}\mu_n))\to(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta)\cdot\theta,\mu_n) \tag{4.10}$$

as $k\to\infty$. By [18, Theorem 1],

$$\mathcal{E}(S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k)),S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))) \\ \le c_p(S_k^{p-1}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k)),S_k(\alpha_k R_{\alpha_k}(\mu_n))\cdot\theta). \tag{4.11}$$

From this and (4.10) we conclude that $\sup_{n\ge1}\|S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))\|_{\mathcal{E}}<\infty$, which implies that, up to subsequence, $\{S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))\}$ is weakly convergent in $\mathcal{E}$ to some $v\in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Since by [9, Lemma 5.1.1] and Remark 4.1 strong, up to a subsequence, convergence in $\mathcal{E}$ implies quasi-uniform convergence, by standard reasoning we get $v=u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta)$. Therefore by (4.10) and [18, Theorem 1],

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta),u_n^{p/2}(\lambda,\theta)) \le \liminf_{k\to\infty}\mathcal{E}(S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k)),S_k^{p/2}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k))) \\ \le c_p\liminf_{k\to\infty}(S_k^{p-1}(u_n(\lambda,\theta,\alpha_k)),S_k(\alpha_k R_{\alpha_k}(\mu_n))\cdot\theta) \\ = c_p(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta)\cdot\theta,\mu_n) \le c_p(u_n^{p-1}(\lambda,\theta)\cdot\theta,\mu). \tag{4.12}$$

Let us choose $\theta_l\in D(A)$ such that $0\le\theta_l\le1$ and $\theta_l\nearrow1$. For instance, one can take $\theta_l = lR_l e_{F_l}$, where e_{F_l} is the equilibrium function for the set F_l (see [9, Chapter 2]) and $\{F_l\}$ is defined at the beginning of the proof. From (4.6) and the fact that

$$u(x) = E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu,\quad x\in E$$

one can deduce that

$$u_n(x;\lambda,\theta_l) \le u, \qquad \lim_{l\to\infty}\lim_{\lambda\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n(x;\lambda,\theta_l) = u(x)$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. This when combined with (4.12) and the assumptions of the proposition gives the desired result. □

Theorem 4.6. *Assume that u is a solution of* (1.1).

(i) *If $\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ then $u \in L^\infty(E;m)$ and*

$$\|u\|_\infty \le c_2(\gamma+1)^{1/(\gamma+1)}\|R\mu\|_\infty^{1/(\gamma+1)}.$$

(ii) *If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+(E)$ then $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and*

$$\|u^{(\gamma+1)/2}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \le c(\gamma)c_2\|\mu\|_{TV}.$$

Proof. (i) By the very definition of the space $S_{00}^{(0)}$, $R\mu \in L^\infty(E;m)$. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula and (1.2),

$$u^{\gamma+1}(x) \le (\gamma+1)E_x\int_0^\zeta g(u)u^\gamma(X_t)\,dA_t^\mu \le c_2(\gamma+1)R\mu(x),$$

from which the desired estimate immediately follows.
(ii) Let us put $\nu = g(u)\cdot\mu$ and $p = 1+\gamma$. Then $p > 1$ and

$$\int_E u^{p-1}\,d\nu \le c_2\int_E u^{p-1}\cdot\frac{1}{u^{p-1}}\,d\mu = c_2\|\mu\|_{TV}.$$

By the above estimate and Proposition 4.5, $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and there exists $c(\gamma) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(u^{(\gamma+1)/2}, u^{(\gamma+1)/2}) \le c(\gamma)\int_E u^\gamma\,d\nu \le c_2c(\gamma)\cdot\|\mu\|_{TV},$$

which completes the proof. □

Example 4.7. Let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ be the form defined by (7.5) with $A = \Delta^{\alpha/2}$ for some $\alpha \in (0,2]$ and bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.
(i) We first give two examples of $\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. Assume that $d > \alpha$. By [9, Example 2.2.1], if $\mu \in S$ and

$$\sup_{x\in D}\int_D \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}}\,\mu(dy) < \infty$$

then $\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. For instance, if $\mu = f\cdot m$ and $f \in L^p(D;m)$ with $p > d/\alpha$ then $f\cdot m \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. Now, let $\alpha = 2$ and let μ denote the Riemannian volume measure on some $(d-1)$ dimensional submanifold Σ of D. Then extending μ by zero to the whole D we get $\mu \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ (see [1, Example iv]). In both cases, by Theorem 4.6(i), the solution u of (1.1) bounded.
(ii) Let $\alpha \in (0, 2\wedge d)$. By [9, Theorem 4.4.4, Eq. (1.5.19)], $D_e[\mathcal{E}] = H_0^{\alpha/2}(D)$, where

$$H_0^{\alpha/2}(D) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d;dx); u = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d\setminus D \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\hat{u}(x)||x|^\alpha\,dx < \infty\}$$

and $\hat{u}$ denotes the Fourier transform of u. Therefore if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ and u is a solution of (1.1) then $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in H_0^{\alpha/2}(D)$.

5 Stability: General results I

In Sections 5–7 we study stability of solutions of the problem

$$-Au_n = g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n, \quad u_n > 0 \tag{5.1}$$

under different assumptions on the convergence of measures μ_n and the limit measure μ. It is known that each measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$ admits a unique decomposition of the form

$$\mu = \mu_d + \mu_c, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\mu_d \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}, \mu_c \in \mathcal{M}_b$ and $\mu_c \perp \mathrm{Cap}$. The measure μ_d is called the diffuse part of μ, whereas μ_c the concentrated part of μ.

In the present section we prove some general results on stability in case $\mu_c \neq 0$. Then in Section 6 we investigate the case where μ is smooth, i.e. $\mu_c = 0$. Finally, in Section 7 we turn back to the case $\mu_c \neq 0$ but we assume that μ_n are of the form $\mu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu$, where j is some mollifier, and that A corresponds to some form $\mathcal{E}$ on $L^2(D; dx)$ with $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence of excessive functions on E such that $u_n \to 0$, m-a.e. Then there exists a subsequence $(n') \subset (n)$ such that $u_{n'} \to 0$ q.e.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $u_n \leq 1$, $n \geq 1$. Let $(n') \subset (n)$ be such that $\sum_{n' \geq 1} \int_E u_{n'} \, d\pi < \infty$ (for the definition of π see Section 2). Let $E \setminus B = \{x \in E;\, u_{n'}(x) \to 0\}$ and let F be a compact subset of E such that $K \subset B$. Then

$$P_\pi(D_F < \zeta) \leq P_\pi(\limsup_{n' \to \infty} u_{n'}(X_{D_F}) > 0) = 0.$$

Indeed, since u_n is an excessive function,

$$P_\pi(u_{n'}(X_{D_F}) > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-1} E_\pi u_{n'}(X_{D_F}) \leq \varepsilon \int_E u_{n'} \, d\pi.$$

Therefore $u_{n'}(X_{D_F}) \to 0$, P_π-a.e. by the Borel-Cantelli lemma. Hence $\mathrm{Cap}(F) = 0$ by [19, Theorem IV.5.28]. Since $F \subset B$ was arbitrary, $\mathrm{Cap}(B) = 0$. □

Let us recall that a sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ of Radon measures on E converges to some Radon measure on E in the narrow topology if $\int_E f \, \mu_n(dx) \to \int_E f \, \mu(dx)$ for every bounded continuous $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$. If the last convergence holds true for every continuous f having compact support then we say that $\{\mu\}$ converges to μ in the vague topology.

Proposition 5.2. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypothesis* (L) *and g satisfies* (1.2) *with $\gamma = 1$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^+$ be such that $\mu \perp \mathrm{Cap}$ and let $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ be a sequence such that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\mu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$ and $\mu_n \to \mu$ in the narrow topology. If u_n is a solution of the problem* (5.1) *then there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (u_n)) such that $u_n \to 0$ q.e.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is regular, there exists $\psi_\varepsilon \in D[\mathcal{E}] \cap C_c(E)$ such that

$$0 \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \int_E (1 - \psi_\varepsilon) \, d\mu \leq \varepsilon, \quad \mathcal{E}(\psi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon \tag{5.3}$$

(see [9, Lemma 2.2.7]). By Theorem 4.6 and [15, Propositions 2.4, 2.11], $u_n \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ is convergent m-a.e. and weakly in $D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ to some function $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Since $u_n \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n, \eta) = (\eta, g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n)$$

for every $\eta \in D[\mathcal{E}] \cap \mathcal{B}^+(E)$. For arbitrary but fixed $k > 0$ set

$$\eta = T_k(u_n)(1 - \psi_\varepsilon) = T_k(u_n) - \psi_\varepsilon T_k(u_n) \in D_e[\mathcal{E}],$$

where T_k is the truncature operator, i.e. $T_k(y) = ((-k) \vee y) \wedge k$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)(1 - \psi_\varepsilon)) &= (T_k(u_n)(1 - \psi_\varepsilon), g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n) \\ &\leq c_2 \int_E \frac{T_k(u_n)(1 - \psi_\varepsilon)}{u_n}\, d\mu_n \leq c_2 \int_E (1 - \psi_\varepsilon)\, d\mu_n.\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)(1 - \psi_\varepsilon)) = \mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)) - \mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)\psi_\varepsilon).$$

Since $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a Dirichlet form, it is Markovian. Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u_n), T_k(u_n)) \leq \mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n))$$

for $n \geq 1$ and consequently,

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u_n), T_k(u_n)) \leq c_2 \int_E (1 - \psi_\varepsilon)\, d\mu_n + \mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)\psi_\varepsilon).$$

Since u_n is a potential,

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)\psi_\varepsilon) \leq k\mathcal{E}(u_n, \psi_\varepsilon).$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n, T_k(u_n)\psi_\varepsilon) \leq k\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(u_n, u_n)} \cdot \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(\psi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon)} \leq k\varepsilon^{1/2}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(u_n, u_n)}.$$

By Theorem 4.6, $c := \sup_{n \geq 1} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}(u_n, u_n)} < \infty$. Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u_n), T_k(u_n)) \leq c_2 \int_E (1 - \psi_\varepsilon)\, d\mu_n + kc\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality and using (5.3) we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u), T_k(u)) \leq c_2\varepsilon + kc\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Since $k, \varepsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, $u \equiv 0$. The result now follows from Lemma 5.1. □

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}_T$. Write

$$T_\Lambda(\omega) = \begin{cases} T(\omega), & \omega \in \Lambda, \\ \infty, & \omega \notin \Lambda. \end{cases}$$

It is well known (see [22, Section III.2]) that $T_\Lambda \in \mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 5.3. *If $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ then $u \in \mathbf{D}$ and for every $\{T_n\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that $T_n \nearrow T \geq \zeta$,*

$$u(X_{T_n}) \to 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$.

Proof. Let $\Lambda = \{\omega \in \Omega : T_n(\omega) < \zeta(\omega), n \geq 1\}$. Then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}_T$ because $\Lambda = \bigcap_{n\geq 1}\{T_n < \zeta\}$ and $\{T_n < \zeta\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T_n} \cap \mathcal{F}_\zeta \subset \mathcal{F}_T$. Also observe that $T = T_\Lambda \wedge T_{\Lambda^c}$ and that T_Λ is predictable. Since $u^+, u^- \in D[\mathcal{E}]$, we may assume that $u \geq 0$. Let $v \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ be an excessive function such that $v \geq u$ q.e. (for the existence of such function see [19, Theorem I.2.6]). By [9, Theorems 2.2.1, 5.1.1] there exists a positive measure $\mu \in S_0^{(0)}$ such that

$$v(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu \tag{5.4}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the strong Markov property,

$$v(X_{T_n}) = \int_{T_n\wedge\zeta}^\zeta dA_t^\mu - \int_{T_n\wedge\zeta}^\zeta dM_t, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e $x \in E$, where

$$M_t = E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta dA_r^\mu | \mathcal{F}_t\Big) - v(X_0), \quad t \geq 0.$$

By (5.4), $v \in \mathbf{D}$. Consequently, $u \in \mathbf{D}$. Since A^μ is continuous,

$$\int_{T_n\wedge\zeta}^\zeta dA_t^\mu \to 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Moreover,

$$\int_{T_n\wedge\zeta}^\zeta dM_r \to \Delta M_\zeta \mathbf{1}_\Lambda = \Delta M_T \mathbf{1}_\Lambda = \Delta M_{T_\Lambda}\mathbf{1}_\Lambda, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Since the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is quasi-left continuous, every martingale with respect to it has only totally inaccessible jumps (see, e.g., [9, Theorem A.3.6]). Hence $\Delta M_{T_\Lambda}\mathbf{1}_\Lambda = 0$, P_x-a.s. since T_Λ is predictable. This proves the lemma. □

The next general stability result will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 7.1, which in turn is used in the proof of our main Theorem 7.3 on existence of solutions of (1.1) with general bounded Borel measure on the right-hand side. Perhaps it is also appropriate to make here the following general comments.

In most papers devoted to stability of solutions of semilinear equations with measure data the following equation

$$-\Delta u = f(x,u) + \mu \tag{5.5}$$

is considered. Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be an approximation of a nonnegative measure μ in the narrow topology and let u_n be a solution of (5.5) with μ replaced by μ_n. Usually the limit u of $\{u_n\}$ depends on the form of the approximation of μ (see [20]). To be more precise, the limit u solves (5.5) with μ replaced by some nonnegative Borel measure $\mu^\#$, depending

on $\{\mu_n\}$, such that $\mu^{\#} \le \mu$ ($\mu^{\#}$ is called the reduced limit of $\{\mu_n\}$). The question naturally arises whether similar phenomenon takes place in case of equations of the form (1.1). In [3] it is observed that in the particular case of equation (1.1) with $A = \Delta$, g satisfying (1.2) with $\gamma \ge 1$ and singular μ (i.e. $\mu = \mu_c$) we have that $u_n \to 0$ for any approximation of μ by uniformly bounded measures μ_n such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ in the narrow topology. In different words, for any approximation of μ in the limit equation the whole singular part of μ disappear. We do not know whether similar result holds true for any $\gamma > 0$ and/or general Dirichlet operator A. However, in Theorem 5.4 below we are able to prove a related result for general A and bounded measure. It says that the limit function u satisfies an equation with a measure ν on the right-hand side which is always smooth independently on the approximation of μ. But let us stress that Theorem 5.4 does not imply the result of [3], because even in case $\mu = \mu_c$ we do not know whether $\nu = 0$. It is also worth mentioning that in Theorem 5.4 we consider the convergence in the vague topology.

In the proof of Theorem 5.4 we will need the following additional notation. For every open set $U \subset E$ we write

$$D_{e,U}[\mathcal{E}] = \{u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}] : u = 0 \text{ q.e. on } E \setminus U\}.$$

It is known (see [9, Theorems 4.4.3, 4.4.4]) that the pair $(\mathcal{E}, D_{e,U}[\mathcal{E}])$ is again a regular transient symmetric Dirichlet form. By $\{R^U_\alpha, \alpha \ge 0\}$ we denote the resolvent associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D_{e,U}[\mathcal{E}])$. For a compact set $F \subset U$ we denote by e^U_F the equilibrium function associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D_{e,U}[\mathcal{E}])$ and F. By [9, Theorem 2.1.5], e^U_F is quasi-continuous and

$$e^U_F = 1 \text{ q.e. on } F, \quad 0 \le e^U_F \le 1 \text{ q.e.}, \quad e^U_F \in D_{e,U}[\mathcal{E}] \subset D_e[\mathcal{E}].$$

The last property implies that $e^U_F = 0$ q.e. on $E \setminus U$.

Theorem 5.4. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypothesis* (L). *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+_b$, $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}^+_{0,b}$ be such that $\sup_{n\ge1} \|\mu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$ and $\mu_n \to \mu$ vaguely. Let u_n be a solution of* (5.1) *and let $\nu_n = g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n$. Then*

(i) *$\{\nu_n\}$ is tight in the vague topology and its each limit point ν belongs to $\mathcal{R}$,*

(ii) *if $\nu_{n'} \to \nu$ vaguely for some subsequence $(n') \subset (n)$ then there is a further subsequence $(n'') \subset (n')$ such that $u_{n''} \to u$, m-a.e., where u is a solution of*

$$-Au = \nu.$$

Proof. Since u_n is a solution of (5.1), it is quasi-continuous, $u_n \in \mathbf{D}$ and by the Markov property there is a martingale additive functional M^n of $\mathbb{X}$ such that

$$u_n(X_t) = \int_t^\zeta g(u_n)(X_r)\, dA^{\mu_n}_r - \int_t^\zeta dM^n_r, \quad t \in [0,\zeta], \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula,

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(X_t) + \int_t^\zeta dK^\gamma_r = (\gamma+1)\int_t^\zeta u_n^\gamma \cdot g(u_n)(X_r)\, dA^{\mu_n}_r - (\gamma+1)\int_t^\zeta u_n^\gamma(X_{r-})\, dM^n_r, \quad t \in [0,\zeta], \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for some increasing process K^γ such that $K_0^\gamma = 0$. Therefore by (1.2),

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(X_t) \le c_2(\gamma+1)E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta dA_r^{\mu_n}|\mathcal{F}_t\Big), \quad t \in [0,\zeta], \quad P_x\text{-a.s.} \tag{5.6}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. In particular, for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$,

$$\int_E u_n^{(\gamma+1)}(x)\, d\beta(x) \le c_2(\gamma+1)\|R\beta\|_\infty \|\mu_n\|_{TV}. \tag{5.7}$$

Observe that

$$u_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\nu_n}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore from (5.7) it follows that for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$,

$$\sup_{n\ge1} \int_E R\beta\, d\nu_n = \sup_{n\ge1} \int_E u_n\, d\beta < \infty. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $K \subset E$ be a compact set. By [9, Lemma 2.2.6], $e_K = R\beta_K$ for some $\beta_K \in S_{00}^{(0)}$, where e_K is the equilibrium function for K. Since e_K is positive and $e_K(x) = 1$ q.e. on K, we conclude from (5.8) that $\{\nu_n\}$ is tight in the vague topology. Let ν denote a limit point of $\{\nu_n\}$. By (5.6) and [5, Lemma 6.1], for every $q \in (0,1)$ we have

$$E_x \sup_{t\ge0} u_n^{q(\gamma+1)}(X_t) \le c_2^q \frac{(\gamma+1)^q}{(1-q)} \Big(E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n}\Big)^q$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. It follows that for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ such that $\beta(E) = 1$,

$$E_\beta \sup_{t\ge0} |u_n(X_t)|^\alpha \le c_2^q \frac{(\gamma+1)^q}{1-q} \Big(E_\beta \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n}\Big)^q \le c_2^q \frac{(\gamma+1)^q}{1-q} \|R\beta\|_\infty^q \|\mu_n\|_{TV}^q, \tag{5.9}$$

where $\alpha = q(\gamma+1)$. By Theorem 4.6,

$$\sup_{n\ge1} \mathcal{E}(u_n^{(\gamma+1)/2}, u_n^{(\gamma+1)/2}) < \infty. \tag{5.10}$$

By [7, Lemma 94, page 306] there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that

$$u_n \to u, \quad m\text{-a.e.}, \tag{5.11}$$

where u is an excessive function. By (5.10), $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Therefore by Lemma 5.3, $u^{(\gamma+1)/2}(X_{T_n}) \to 0$ for every sequence $\{T_n\}$ of stopping times such that $T_n \nearrow T \ge \zeta$. This implies that for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$u(X_{T_n}) \to 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.} \tag{5.12}$$

A key step in showing that ν is smooth is the proof that u is a potential. We first prove the last property in the simpler case where (1.2) is satisfied for some $\gamma \ge 1$. Since $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D[\mathcal{E}]$, it belongs to $\mathbf{D}$ by Lemma 5.3. Therefore by (5.12),

$$E_x u^{(\gamma+1)/2}(X_{T_n}) \to 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. From this we conclude that if $\gamma \geq 1$ then for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$(E_x u(X_{T_n}))^{(\gamma+1)/2} \leq E_x u^{(\gamma+1)/2}(X_{T_n}) \to 0, \tag{5.13}$$

so if (1.2) with $\gamma \geq 1$ is satisfied then u is a potential. Now we turn to the case $\gamma \in (0,1)$. It is perhaps worth explaining why it differs from the case $\gamma \geq 1$. To show that u is a potential we have to know that $E_x u(X_{T_n}) \to 0$. This may be concluded from (5.12) if $u \in \mathbf{D}$. Unfortunately, the last assertion cannot be concluded from the fact $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D[\mathcal{E}]$ when (1.2) is satisfied with $\gamma \in (0,1)$. Now we give an alternative way to prove that $u \in \mathbf{D}$. It is independent of the value of $\gamma > 0$. For $x \in E$ write

$$\lambda_x^\alpha = \delta_{\{x\}} \circ R_\alpha.$$

Since $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypothesis (L), $\lambda_x^\alpha \ll m$ for every $x \in E$. Moreover, since u_n is a quasi-continuous excessive function, $\alpha R_\alpha u_n(x) \leq u_n(x)$ for q.e $x \in E$. From this and (5.11) it follows that for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n\to\infty} u_n(x) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \alpha R_\alpha u_n(x) &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_E \alpha u_n(y) \lambda_x^\alpha(y)\, m(dy) \\ &\geq \int_E \alpha u(y) \lambda_x^\alpha(y)\, m(dy) = \alpha R_\alpha u(x). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Since $u^{(\gamma+1)/2} \in D[\mathcal{E}]$, u is quasi-continuous. Hence $\alpha R_\alpha u(x) \nearrow u(x)$ for q.e. $x \in E$ as $\alpha \nearrow \infty$. Therefore (5.14) implies that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} u_n(x) \geq u(x) \tag{5.15}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the above, for q.e. $x \in E$ we have

$$u^\alpha(X_t) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} u_n^\alpha(X_t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} u^\alpha(X_t) \leq \sup_{t\geq 0} \liminf_{n\to\infty} u_n^\alpha(X_t) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\geq 0} u_n^\alpha(X_t).$$

By Fatou's lemma,

$$E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0} u^\alpha(X_t) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0} u_n^\alpha(X_t) \leq \sup_{n\geq 1} E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0} u_n^\alpha(X_t),$$

so by (5.9),

$$E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0} u^\alpha(X_t) \leq c_2^q \frac{(\gamma+1)^q}{1-q} \|R\beta\|_\infty^q (\sup_{n\geq 1} \|\mu_n\|_{TV}^q)$$

for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ such that $\beta(E) = 1$. Since $\alpha > 1$, we get in particular that $u \in \mathbf{D}$. Therefore by (5.12), for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$E_x u(X_{T_n}) \to 0$$

for every $\{T_n\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that $T_n \nearrow T \geq \zeta$, which implies that u is a potential. Therefore by [2, Theorem IV.4.22] and [9, Theorem 5.1.4] there exists a smooth measure $\bar{\nu}$ such that

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\bar{\nu}} \tag{5.16}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Let $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. Then by (5.7), (5.15) and [6, Theorem 26, page 28] there exists $v \in L^1(E;\beta)$ such that

$$\int_E |u_n - v|\, d\beta \to 0.$$

By (5.10), (5.11) and the Banach-Saks theorem,

$$\frac{u_1^\gamma + \ldots + u_n^\gamma}{n} \to u^\gamma \quad \text{in } (\mathcal{E}, D_e[\mathcal{E}])$$

as $n \to \infty$. By this and [9, Theorem 2.1.4] we may assume that the above convergence holds q.e. Hence

$$\frac{u_1^\gamma + \ldots + u_n^\gamma}{n} \to u^\gamma, \quad \beta\text{-a.e.}$$

From this we easily deduce that $v = u$, β-a.e. Consequently,

$$(R\beta, \nu_n) \to (R\beta, \bar{\nu}). \tag{5.17}$$

By Dynkin's formula (see [9, (4.4.3)]) and [9, Section 2.3], for every open $U \subset E$,

$$R^U\beta = R\beta - R(\beta)_{E\setminus U},$$

where $(\beta)_{E\setminus U}$ is the sweeping out of β on $E \setminus U$. Since $R(\beta)_{E\setminus U} \le R\beta$, we have that $(\beta)_{E\setminus U} \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ because by [16, Lemma 5.4], $(\beta)_{E\setminus U}(E) \le \beta(E)$. Therefore from (5.17) it follows that

$$(R^U\beta, \nu_n) \to (R^U\beta, \bar{\nu}). \tag{5.18}$$

Let $\Pi = \{F \subset E : F\text{-compact}, \nu(\partial F) = 0\}$. Then Π is a π-system and $\sigma(\Pi) = \mathcal{B}(E)$. For $F \in \Pi$ let $F_\varepsilon = \{x \in E; \operatorname{dist}(x, F) < \varepsilon\}$. Since E is locally compact, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that F_ε is relatively compact. By [9, Lemma 2.2.6] and comments following it, $e_F^{F_\varepsilon} = R^{F_\varepsilon}\beta$ for some $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$, so by (5.18) we have

$$\bar{\nu}(F_\varepsilon) \ge (e_F^{F_\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}) \ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \nu_n(\mathrm{Int}F) \ge \nu(\mathrm{Int}F) = \nu(F).$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be made arbitrarily small, it follows that $\bar{\nu}(F) \ge \nu(F)$ for $F \in \Pi$. On the other hand, again by (5.18),

$$\bar{\nu}(F) \le (e_F^{F_\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}) \le \limsup_{n\to 0} \nu_n(\overline{F_\varepsilon}) \le \nu(\overline{F_\varepsilon}).$$

Hence $\bar{\nu}(F) \le \nu(F)$, $F \in \Pi$. Therefore $\bar{\nu}(F) = \nu(F)$ for $F \in \Pi$, which implies that $\bar{\nu} = \nu$. □

6 Stability: General results II

In the further study of stability an important role will be played by a new type of convergence of measures of the class $\mathcal{R}$, which we define below. Since this convergence is related to the uniform convergence of associated additive functionals, we will denote it by $\xrightarrow{uAF}$.

Definition. Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{R}$. We say that $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ if for every sequence $(n') \subset (n)$ there exists a further subsequence $(n'') \subset (n')$ such that

$$\lim_{n''\to\infty} E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_{n''}} - A_t^{\mu}| = 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies hypothesis* (L). *Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{R}$ and let u_n, u be solutions of*

$$-Au_n = \mu_n, \quad -Au = \mu. \tag{6.1}$$

If $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ then there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (u_n)) such that $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly.

Proof. By the assumption, up to a subsequence we have

$$E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_n} - A_t^{\mu}| \to 0 \tag{6.2}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By (6.1) and the definition of a solution,

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)| \leq \sup_{t\geq 0} E_x(\sup_{r\geq 0} |A_r^{\mu_n} - A_r^{\mu}||\mathcal{F}_t).$$

From this and [5, Lemma 6.1], for every $q \in (0,1)$ we have

$$E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)|^q \leq \frac{1}{1-q}(E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |A_t^{\mu_n} - A_t^{\mu}|)^q.$$

By (6.2), for q.e. $x \in E$ the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to zero as $n \to \infty$, which by Remark 4.1 completes the proof. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let u be a quasi-continuous function. Then*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}(\{u > k\}) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\{F_n\}$ be a nest such that u is continuous on F_n for every $n \geq 1$. Since $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a regular Dirichlet form, the capacity Cap generated by $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is tight (see [19, Remark IV.3.2]), i.e. there exists a nest $\{\tilde{F}_m\}$ of compact subsets of E such that $\mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus \tilde{F}_m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. By subadditivity of the capacity Cap,

$$\mathrm{Cap}(u > k) \leq \mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus F_n) + \mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus \tilde{F}_m) + \mathrm{Cap}(F_n \cap \tilde{F}_m, u > k).$$

Since $F_n \cap \tilde{F}_m$ is compact and u is continuous on F_n, u is bounded on $F_n \cap \tilde{F}_m$. Hence $\mathrm{Cap}(F_n \cap \tilde{F}_m,\, u > k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. The other two terms converge to zero by the definition of the nest. □

Theorem 6.3 below will play a key role in the proof of our main result on existence of solutions of (1.1) with general $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$ (Theorem 7.3). It is worth pointing out that Theorem 6.3 is new even in case $A = \Delta$.

Theorem 6.3. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$ and Meyer's hypotheses* (L). *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ be nontrivial and let $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ be a sequence such that $\sup_{n\geq 1} \|\mu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$ and $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$. If u_n, u are solutions of*

$$-Au_n = g(u_n)\cdot\mu_n, \quad u_n > 0, \quad -Au = g(u)\cdot\mu, \quad u > 0 \tag{6.3}$$

with g satisfying (H) *then there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (u_n)) such that $u_n \to u$ q.e.*

Proof. Let $g_1(u) = g(u) \wedge 1$, $u > 0$, and let w_n be a solution of the problem

$$-Aw_n = g_1(w_n)\mu_n, \quad w_n > 0.$$

By Proposition 3.2, $w_n \leq u_n$ q.e. and $w_n \leq v_n$ q.e., where

$$v_n(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n}, \quad x \in E.$$

Put

$$v(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\mu}, \quad x \in E.$$

By Proposition 6.1, up to a subsequence, $v_n \to v$ quasi-uniformly. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula and (1.2), for $k \geq c_1^{1/\gamma}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_n(x) \wedge k &\geq E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{w_n\leq k\}}(X_t)\Big(\frac{c_1}{w_n^\gamma(X_t)} \wedge 1\Big)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \\ &\geq E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{w_n\leq k\}}(X_t)\Big(\frac{c_1}{k^\gamma} \wedge 1\Big)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \geq \frac{c_1}{k^\gamma} E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{v_n\leq k\}}(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\{F_m\}$ be a nest such that $v_n \to v$ uniformly on F_m for every $m \geq 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ let us choose $n(\varepsilon, m)$ so that $|v_n(x) - v(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for $x \in F_m$ and $n \geq n(\varepsilon, m)$. Then

$$w_n(x) \wedge k \geq \frac{c_1}{k^\gamma} E_x \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_{F_m}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\{v\leq k-\varepsilon\}}(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n}.$$

Let $\eta > 0$ be such that $R\eta \leq 1$. Write $C_{k,\varepsilon}^m = F_m \cap \{v \leq k - \varepsilon\}$ and $\eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m(x) = E_x \int_0^{\tau_{C_{k,\varepsilon}^m}} \eta(X_t)\, dt$. Then $\eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and $\eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m \leq 1$ q.e., $\eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m = 0$ q.e. on $E \setminus C_{\varepsilon,k}^m$. Hence for $n \geq n(\varepsilon, m)$,

$$w_n(x) \wedge k \geq \frac{c_1}{k^\gamma} E_x \int_0^\zeta \eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n}$$

for q.e $x \in E$. By [19, Theorem IV.5.28] $P_x(\lim_{k,m\to\infty} \tau_{C_{k,\varepsilon}^m} < \zeta) = 0$ for q.e. $x \in E$. Hence

$$\eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m(x) \nearrow E_x \int_0^\zeta \eta(X_t)\, dt > 0, \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in E. \tag{6.4}$$

Let

$$\psi_{n,\varepsilon}^m(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta \eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n}, \quad \psi_\varepsilon^m(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta \eta_{k,\varepsilon}^m(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu}.$$

Then for $n \geq n(\varepsilon, m)$,

$$0 \leq \psi^m_{n,\varepsilon}(x)\frac{c_1}{k^\gamma} \leq u_n(x) \wedge k$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the assumptions, up to a subsequence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |\int_0^t \eta^m_{k,\varepsilon}(X_r)\, d(A^{\mu_n}_r - A^{\mu}_r)| = 0 \tag{6.5}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By [5, Lemma 6.1],

$$E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |\psi^m_{n,\varepsilon}(X_t) - \psi^m_{\varepsilon}(X_t)|^q \leq \frac{1}{1-q}\Big(E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |\int_0^t \eta^m_{k,\varepsilon}(X_r)\, d(A^{\mu_n}_r - A^{\mu}_r)|\Big)^q.$$

This together with (6.5) and Remark 4.1 shows that up to a subsequence,

$$\psi^m_{n,\varepsilon} \to \psi^m_{\varepsilon} \quad \text{quasi-uniformly as } n \to \infty. \tag{6.6}$$

Therefore for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $m \geq 1$ there exists a nest $\{F^{\varepsilon,m}_j,\, j \geq 1\}$ such that $\psi^m_{n,\varepsilon} \to \psi^m_{\varepsilon}$ uniformly on $F^{\varepsilon,m}_j$ for every $j \geq 1$. By [7, Lemma 94, page 306] there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ converges m-a.e. Now we will show that one can choose a subsequence such that $\{u_n\}$ converges q.e. To this end, for $a > 0$ set

$$B^{n,m}_a = \{u_n \geq \frac{1}{a}\} \cap F_m, \qquad A^m_{a,\varepsilon} = \{\frac{c_1}{k^\gamma}\psi^m_{\varepsilon} \geq \frac{1}{a} - \varepsilon\} \cap F_m \cap F^{\varepsilon,m}_{j(\varepsilon,m)}$$

and

$$D^m_{a,\varepsilon} = A^m_{a,\varepsilon} \setminus (E \setminus A^m_{a,\varepsilon})^r,$$

where $(E \setminus A^m_{a,\varepsilon})^r$ is the set of regular points for $E \setminus A^m_{a,\varepsilon}$ (see [9]) and $j(\varepsilon, m)$ is such that $\mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus F^{\varepsilon,m}_{j(\varepsilon,m)}) < \varepsilon/m$. It is known that $D^m_{a,\varepsilon}$ is the fine interior of $A^m_{a,\varepsilon}$. Then

$$B^{n,m}_a \supset A^m_{a,\varepsilon}, \quad n \geq n(m, \varepsilon)$$

and $\{p^{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}_t,\, t \geq 0\}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2(D^m_{a,\varepsilon}; m)$, where

$$p^{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}_t u(x) = E_x u(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t<\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}\}}, \quad x \in D^m_{a,\varepsilon}.$$

By the probabilistic definition of a solution of (6.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_n(x) - E_x u_n(X_{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})| &= E_x \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} g(u_n)(X_r)\, dA^{\mu_n}_r \\ &\leq c_2 \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} \frac{1}{|u_n|^\gamma}(X_r)\, dA^{\mu_n}_r \leq c_2 a^\gamma \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} dA^{\mu_n}_r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \sup_{n\geq 1} |u_n(x) - E_x u_n(X_{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})| \leq c_2 \cdot a^\gamma \lim_{t\to 0^+} \sup_{n\geq 1} E_x \int_0^t dA^{\mu_n}_r.$$

Since $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $t \geq 0$,

$$|E_x \int_0^t dA^{\mu_n}_r - E_x \int_0^t dA^{\mu}_r| \leq \delta, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}|u_n(x)-E_xu_n(X_{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})|\le c_2a^\gamma\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}E_x\int_0^t dA^{\mu_n}_r$$
$$\le c_2a^\gamma\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}(\delta+E_xA^\mu_t)=c_2a^\gamma\delta.$$

Since $\delta>0$ was arbitrary, we get

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}|u_n(x)-E_xu_n(X_{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})|=0. \tag{6.7}$$

By the definition of the set $(E\setminus A^m_{a,\varepsilon})^r$,

$$P_x(\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}>0)=1,\quad x\in D^m_{a,\varepsilon}. \tag{6.8}$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula and (1.2), for every stopping time τ we have

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(X_\tau)\le c_2(1+\gamma)E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta dA^{\mu_n}_t|\mathcal{F}_\tau\Big). \tag{6.9}$$

It is clear that the family $\{A^{\mu_n}_\zeta\}$ is uniformly integrable under P_x for q.e. $x\in E$. Therefore the family $\{E_x(\int_0^\zeta dA^{\mu_n}_t|\mathcal{F}_\tau), n\ge 1\}$ is uniformly integrable under P_x, and hence for fixed $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$ the family $\{u_n(X_\tau), n\ge 1\}$ is uniformly integrable under P_x for q.e. $x\in E$. From this and (6.8) it follows that for every $x\in D^m_{a,\varepsilon}$,

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}|E_xu_n(X_{t\wedge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})-E_xu_n(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t<\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}\}}|\le\lim_{t\to 0^+}\sup_{n\ge 1}\int_{\{t\ge\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}\}}|u_n(X_{\tau_{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}})|=0.$$

As a result,

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\sup_{n\ge 1}|u_n(x)-p_t^{D^m_{a,\varepsilon}}u_n(x)|=0\quad\text{q.e. on } D^m_{a,\varepsilon}. \tag{6.10}$$

By (6.9),

$$u_n^{\gamma+1}(x)\le c_2(1+\gamma)v_n(x) \tag{6.11}$$

for q.e. $x\in E$. Since $\{v_n\}$ converges quasi-uniformly, there exists a nest, and we may assume that it is $\{F_n\}$, such that $\{u_n\}$ is uniformly bounded on F_k for every $k\ge 1$. Therefore by [15, Theorem 2.2, Proposition 2.4], $\{u_n\}$ has a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ is convergent and its limit is finite for q.e. $x\in D^m_{a,\varepsilon}$. Let $a_n\nearrow\infty$ and let $A_n=A^n_{a_n,(2a_n)^{-1}}$, $D_n=D^n_{a_n,(2a_n)^{-1}}$. By F let us denote the fine support of μ. Since μ is nontrivial, $\mathrm{Cap}(F)>0$. Therefore by (6.4) there exist n_0 such that $\mathrm{Cap}(\eta^{n_0}_{n_0,\frac{1}{2a_{n_0}}},F)>0$. Since $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$, we have

$$\psi^n_{(2a_n)^{-1}}>0,\quad n\ge n_0\quad\text{q.e.}$$

Therefore, by (6.6) and Lemma 6.2,

$$\mathrm{Cap}(\psi^n_{n,(2a_n)^{-1}}<a_n^{-1})\le\mathrm{Cap}(\psi^{n_0}_{n,(2a_{n_0})^{-1}}<a_n^{-1})\to 0,\quad n\to\infty.$$

Since $\{A_n\}$ is a nest, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus A_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E_\pi \int_{D_{E\setminus A_n}}^{\infty} e^{-t}\varphi(X_t)\,dt = 0, \tag{6.12}$$

the first equality being a consequence of [19, Theorem IV.5.28]. By [19, Theorem IV.5.28] again and [19, Lemma V.2.19],

$$\mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus D_n) = E_\pi \int_{D_{E\setminus D_n}}^{\infty} e^{-t}\varphi(X_t)\,dt \tag{6.13}$$

for $n \geq 1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that the sequence $\{A_n\}$ is increasing, and consequently that $\{D_n\}$ is increasing, for otherwise we can replace $\{A_n\}$ by $\{\tilde{A}_n\}$, where $\tilde{A}_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_k$, and consider $\tilde{D}_n = \tilde{A}_n \setminus (E \setminus \tilde{A}_n)^r$ in place of D_n. Therefore by (6.12), $P_\pi(\lim_{n\to\infty} D_{E\setminus A_n} < \zeta) = 0$. Since for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$,

$$\sigma_B = D_B \quad \text{on } \{D_B > 0\}, \tag{6.14}$$

we deduce from (6.12) that

$$P_\pi(\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_{A_n} < \zeta) = 0. \tag{6.15}$$

By [24, Proposition 10.6],

$$\tau_{A_n} = \tau_{D_n}, \quad P_\pi\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence $P_\pi(\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_{D_n} < \zeta) = 0$ and by (6.14), $P_\pi(\lim_{n\to\infty} D_{E\setminus D_n} < \zeta) = 0$. This and (6.13) show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}(E \setminus D_n) = 0. \tag{6.16}$$

We have proved that for every $m \geq 1$ there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ converges q.e. and its limit is finite q.e. on D_m. Therefore by (6.16) one can find a further subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $\{u_n\}$ converges q.e. and its limit is finite q.e. on E. Let $w = \lim_{n\to\infty} u_n$ q.e. Since $\{u_n\}$ is q.e. convergent,

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} E_x A_\zeta^{\nu_n} = \sup_{n\geq 1} u_n(x) < \infty.$$

Therefore by [12, Section 4] the sequence $\{u_n(X)\}$ is uniformly S-tight under P_x for q.e. $x \in E$. It is also clear that for every $t \geq 0$, $u_n(X_t) \to w(X_t)$ in probability P_x for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore by [11, Theorem 1], the definition of the sets $\{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}\}$ and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

$$E_x \int_0^{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} g(u_n)(X_t)\,dA_t^{\mu_n} \to E_x \int_0^{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} g(w)(X_t)\,dA_t^{\mu} \tag{6.17}$$

as $n \to \infty$ for q.e. $x \in E$. Moreover, since $u_n \to w$ q.e.,

$$u_n(X_{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}}) \to w(X_{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}}), \quad P_x\text{-a.s.} \tag{6.18}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the definition of a solution of (6.3),

$$u_n(X_t) = E_x u_n(X_{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}}) + E_x \int_0^{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} g(u_n)(X_t)\,dA_t^{\mu_n}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By the above, (6.17) and (6.18),

$$w(x) = E_x w(X_{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}}) + E_x \int_0^{\tau_{A^m_{a,\varepsilon}}} g(w)(X_t)\, dA^\mu_t \tag{6.19}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By (6.11), w is a potential. Therefore replacing $A^m_{a,\varepsilon}$ in (6.19) by A_n, letting $n \to \infty$ and using (6.15) we obtain

$$w(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta g(w)(X_t)\, dA^\mu_t$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By uniqueness, $w = u$. □

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$. If $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_{TV} \to 0$ then $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$.*

Proof. Let $u_n(x) = E_x A^{\mu_n}_\zeta$, $u(x) = E_x A^\mu_\zeta$. By [5, Lemma 6.1], for every $q \in (0,1)$,

$$E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)|^q \leq \frac{1}{1-q}\Big(E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{|\mu_n - \mu|}\Big)^q$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, where $|\mu^n - \mu|$ stands for the total variation of the measure $\mu_n - \mu$. Let $\beta \in S^{(0)}_{00}$ be such that $\beta(E) = 1$. Then from the above inequality we conclude that for every $q \in (0,1)$,

$$E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)|^q \leq \frac{1}{1-q}\Big(E_\beta \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{|\mu_n-\mu|}\Big)^q \leq \frac{1}{1-q}\|R_\beta\|^q_\infty \|\mu - \mu_n\|^q_{TV}.$$

By Remark 4.1 there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n)) such that $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly. Therefore the proposition follows from Proposition 4.3. □

The following proposition answers the question raised in [3, Remark 3.6].

Theorem 6.5. *Assume that g satisfies* (H). *Let $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be nontrivial, $\{\nu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}^+_{0,b}$ and let u_n, v_n denote solutions of the problems*

$$-Au_n = g(u_n)\cdot \mu_n, \quad u_n > 0, \qquad -Av_n = g(v_n)\cdot(\nu_n + \mu_n), \quad v_n > 0.$$

If $u_n \to 0$ in the topology of m-a.e. convergence, $\sup_{n\geq 1}\|\nu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$ and $\nu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \nu$ for some nontrivial $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+_{0,b}$ then $v_n \to v$ in the topology of m-a.e. convergence, where v is a solution of

$$-Av = g(v)\cdot\nu, \quad v > 0. \tag{6.20}$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, $u_n \leq v_n$, so by monotonicity of g,

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta g(v_n)(X_t)\, dA^{\mu_n}_t \leq E_x \int_0^\zeta g(u_n)(X_t)\, dA^{\mu_n}_t = u_n(x).$$

By the assumptions of the proposition, up to a subsequence,

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta g(v_n)(X_t)\, dA^{\mu_n}_t \to 0 \tag{6.21}$$

as $n \to \infty$ for m-a.e. $x \in E$. Let w_n be a solution of

$$-Aw_n = g(w_n) \cdot \nu_n, \quad w_n > 0.$$

By the Meyer-Tanaka formula,

$$\begin{aligned} |w_n(x) - v_n(x)| &\le E_x \int_0^\zeta \operatorname{sgn}(w_n - v_n)(X_t)(g(w_n)(X_t) - g(v_n)(X_t))\, dA_t^{\nu_n} \\ &\quad - E_x \int_0^\zeta \operatorname{sgn}(w_n - v_n) g(v_n)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \\ &\le E_x \int_0^\zeta g(v_n)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n}. \end{aligned}$$

By the above estimate and (6.21), up to a subsequence we have $|w_n - v_n| \to 0$, m-a.e. Since $\sup_{n\ge1} \|\nu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$, applying Theorem 6.3 shows that, up to a subsequence, $w_n \to v$, m-a.e., which completes the proof. □

Proposition 6.6. *Let g, $\{\mu_n\}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.5 and u_n, v_n be as in Theorem 6.5, with $\{\nu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$ such that $\|\nu_n - \nu\|_{TV} \to 0$ for some nontrivial $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}^+$. Then $v_n \to v$ in the topology of m-a.e. convergence.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 6.4 and Theorem 6.5. □

We close this section with some results showing that $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ is "locally equidiffuse" if it converges in the uAF sense. These results will not be needed later on in our study of stability of solutions of (5.1). However, we find them interesting and we think that they shed a new light on the nature of the convergence in the uAF sense.

Let us recall that a family $\{\mu_t, t \in T\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ is called equidiffuse if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, if $\operatorname{Cap}(A) < \delta$ then $|\mu_t|(A) < \varepsilon$ for every $t \in T$.

Proposition 6.7. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E}.7)$. Let $\mu, \mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ be such that $\sup_{n\ge1} \|\mu_n\|_{TV} < \infty$ and $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$. Then there exists a bounded excessive function $\eta \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ such that $\eta > 0$ and the family $\{\eta \cdot \mu_n\}$ is equidiffuse.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.1, if u_n, u are defined by (6.1) then, up to a subsequence, $u_n \to u$ quasi-uniformly. It follows that there exists a nest $\{F_k\}$ such that for every $k \ge 1$,

$$\sup_{n\ge1} \sup_{x \in F_k} u_n(x) < \infty. \tag{6.22}$$

Since m is a smooth measure, there exists a nest $\{\tilde{F}_n\}$ such that $\|R\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{F}_n}\|_\infty < \infty$ and $m(\tilde{F}_n) < \infty$ for $n \ge 1$. Therefore there exists a closed set F such that $\eta := R\mathbf{1}_F > 0$, $\|R\mathbf{1}_F\|_\infty < \infty$, $m(F) < \infty$ and $F \subset F_k$ for some $k \ge 1$. It is clear that η is excessive and $\eta \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Let $\beta := \mathbf{1}_F \cdot m$. Then for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$,

$$\int_B \eta\, d\mu_n = \int_B R\mathbf{1}_F\, d\mu_n = E_\beta \int_0^\zeta \mathbf{1}_B(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} \le E_\beta \int_{D_B}^\zeta dA_t^{\mu_n}. \tag{6.23}$$

The family $\{A^{\mu_n}_\zeta\}$ is uniformly integrable under the measure P_β. To see this, let us first observe that by (6.22),

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}\int_E |u_n(x)|^2\,\beta(dx) = \sup_{n\geq 1}\int_F |u_n(x)|^2\,m(dx) < \infty.$$

Since $u_n \to u$, m-a.e., it follows that

$$E_\beta A^{\mu_n}_\zeta = \int_E u_n(x)\,\beta(dx) \to \int_E u(x)\,\beta(dx) = E_\beta A^{\mu}_\zeta.$$

On the other hand, since $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$, $A^{\mu_n}_\zeta \to A^{\mu}_\zeta$ in measure P_β, which proves that $\{A^{\mu_n}_\zeta\}$ is uniformly integrable under P_β. The uniform integrability implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_\beta \sup_{t\geq 0}|A^{\mu_n}_t - A^{\mu}_t| = 0. \tag{6.24}$$

Suppose that, contrary to our claim, the family $\{\eta\cdot\mu_n\}$ is not equidiffuse. Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sequence $\{B_k\}$ of Borel subsets of E such that $\mathrm{Cap}(B_k)\to 0$ and $\sup_{n\geq 1}\int_{B_k}\eta d\mu_n \geq \varepsilon$, $k\geq 1$. Then by Theorem IV.5.28 and Lemma 2.19 in [19],

$$P_\beta(\lim_{k\to\infty} D_{B_k}\wedge\zeta = \zeta) = 1.$$

From this, (6.23) and (6.24) it follows that $\sup_{n\geq 1}\int_{B_k}\eta\,d\mu_n \to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. This leads to the contradiction that $\{\eta\cdot\mu_n\}$ is not equidiffuse. □

Corollary 6.8. *Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be as in Proposition 6.7. If $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is strongly Feller then for every compact $K\subset E$ the family $\{\mathbf{1}_K\cdot\mu_n\}$ is equidiffuse.*

Proof. Follows from the fact that every excessive function with respect to a strongly Feller Dirichlet form is lower semi-continuous. □

7 Stability: Approximation of measures by mollification

In this section we assume that μ is a nontrivial Borel measure on a subset E of $\mathbb{R}^d$. By putting $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus E) = 0$ we may and will assume that μ is a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We study stability of solutions u_n of (5.1) in case

$$\mu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu, \quad n\geq 1, \tag{7.1}$$

where $j_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d} j(\varepsilon^{-1}x)$ for $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and

$$j(x) = \begin{cases} c\exp(\frac{1}{|x|^2-1}), & |x|<1,\\ 0, & |x|\geq 1\end{cases}$$

with $c>0$ chosen so that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} j(x)\,dx = 1$. By (5.2), u_n is a solution of the equation

$$-Au_n = g(u_n)\cdot(j_{1/n}*\mu_d + j_{1/n}*\mu_c). \tag{7.2}$$

We shall show that for some class of operators Theorem 6.5 is applicable to (7.2). To this end, we first consider the case $\mu_d = 0$ in Theorem 7.1 below, and then we show that $j_{1/n}*\mu_d \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu_d$.

In the proof of the following theorem a key role is played by Theorem 5.4.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a form on $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $(\mathcal{E}.7)$ and Meyer's hypothesis* (L). *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^+$ be a nontrivial measure such that $\mu \perp \mathrm{Cap}$. Let u_n denote a solution of the problem*

$$-Au_n = g(u_n) \cdot \mu_n, \quad u_n > 0$$

with μ_n defined by (7.1). *Then $u_n \to 0$ in the topology of m-a.e. convergence as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ be such that $\mathrm{Cap}(B) = 0$ and $\mu(E \setminus B) = 0$. Since μ is finite, there exists an increasing sequence $\{F_k\}$ of closed subsets of E such that $\mu(B \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k) = 0$. Let $\mu^k = \mathbf{1}_{F_k} \cdot \mu$, $\mu_n^k = j_{1/n} * \mu^k$. Then $\mu = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mu^k$ and $\mu_n = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mu_n^k$ in the total variation norm. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\|\mu^k - \mu\|_{TV} \le k^{-1}$ for $k \ge 1$. Let $\nu_n^k = g(u_n^k) \cdot \mu_n^k$, $k, n \ge 1$, where u_n^k is a solution of

$$-Au_n^k = g(u_n^k) \cdot \mu_n^k, \quad u_n^k > 0.$$

By Theorem 5.4, for every sequence (n') there exists a subsequence (still denoted by (n')) and a smooth measure ν^k such that $\nu_{n'}^k \to \nu^k$ vaguely and $u_{n'}^k \to u^k$, m-a.e. as $n' \to \infty$, where $-Au^k = \nu^k$. For a closed set $F \subset E$ and $n \ge 1$ write $B(F, n) = \{x \in E : \mathrm{dist}(x, F) \le 1/n\}$. By the properties of the vague convergence, for every $n \ge 1$ we have

$$0 = \liminf_{n'\to\infty} \nu_{n'}^k(E \setminus B(F_k, n)) \ge \nu^k(E \setminus B(F_k, n)).$$

Since this holds for every $n \ge 1$, $\nu^k(E \setminus F_k) = 0$. Hence $\nu^k \equiv 0$, because $\mathrm{Cap}(F_k) = 0$ and ν^k is a smooth measure. As a consequence, $u^k = 0$. By Proposition 3.2, $u_n^k \le u_n$. By the Meyer-Tanaka formula, (H) and (1.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_n(x) - u_n^k(x)|^{\gamma+1} &\le (1+\gamma)E_x \int_0^{\zeta} (u_n - u_n^k)^{\gamma}(X_t)(g(u_n)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n} - g(u_n^k)(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n^k}) \\
&= (1+\gamma)E_x \int_0^{\zeta} (u_n - u_n^k)^{\gamma}(X_t)(g(u_n) - g(u_n^k))(X_t)\, dA_t^{\mu_n^k} \\
&\quad + (1+\gamma)E_x \int_0^{\zeta} g(u_n)(X_t)(u_n - u_n^k)^{\gamma}(X_t)\, (dA_t^{\mu_n} - dA_t^{\mu_n^k}) \\
&\le (1+\gamma)E_x \int_0^{\zeta} g(u_n)(u_n)^{\gamma}(X_t)\, (dA_t^{\mu_n} - dA_t^{\mu_n^k}) \\
&\le (1+\gamma)c_2 E_x \int_0^{\zeta} dA_t^{|\mu_n - \mu_n^k|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$. From the above inequality we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E |u_n - u_n^k|^{1+\gamma}\, d\beta \le (1+\gamma)c_2 E_\beta \int_0^{\zeta} dA_t^{|\mu_n - \mu_n^k|} &\le (1+\gamma)c_2 \|R\beta\|_\infty \cdot \|\mu_n - \mu_n^k\|_{TV} \\
&\le (1+\gamma)c_2 \|R\beta\|_\infty k^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$,

$$\int_E u_{n'}\, d\beta \le \int_E |u_{n'} - u_{n'}^k|\, d\beta + \int_E u_{n'}^k\, d\beta \le c(\beta, \gamma, c_2)k^{-1} + \int_E u_{n'}^k\, d\beta.$$

Letting $n' \to \infty$ and then $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality we see that $\int_E u_{n'}\, d\beta \to 0$ for every finite $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$, which implies that, up to a subsequence, $u_{n'} \to 0$, m-a.e. $\square$

In the rest of the section we confine ourselves to the class of forms defined below. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{2}(Bx, x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 - \cos(x, y)) J(dy), \tag{7.3}$$

where B is a d-dimensional nonnegative definite symmetric matrix and J is a symmetric Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|x|^2}{1 + |x|^2} J(dx) < \infty.$$

Consider the form $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)$ defined as

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{u}(x)\bar{\hat{v}}(x)\psi(x)\, dx, \\ D[\mathcal{B}] = \{u \in L^2(E; dx);\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{u}(x)|^2 \psi(x)\, dx < \infty\}, \end{cases} \tag{7.4}$$

where $\hat{u}$ stands for the Fourier transform of u. It is well known (see [9, Example 1.4.1]) that $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ is a symmetric regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)$.

An important example of ψ of the form (7.3) is $\psi(x) = \phi(|x|^2)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\phi : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a Bernstein function, i.e. smooth function such that $(-1)^n D^n \phi \le 0$ for $n \ge 1$. In this case the operator A associated with the form $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ is equal to $\phi(\Delta)$. For instance, $A = \Delta^{\alpha/2}$ for $\phi(x) = x^{\alpha/2}$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$.

It is well known (see [9, Example 1.4.1]) that if $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ satisfies Meyer's hypotheses (L) then the α-Green function $G_\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ has the property that

$$G_\alpha(x, y) = G_\alpha(x - y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some real function G_α defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

For an arbitrary open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ denote the part of $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ on D, i.e.

$$D[\mathcal{E}] = \{u \in D[\mathcal{B}] : u = 0,\ m\text{-a.e on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus D\}, \quad \mathcal{E}(u, v) = \mathcal{B}(u, v),\ u, v \in D[\mathcal{E}]. \tag{7.5}$$

By [9, Theorems 4.4.3, 4.4.4], $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a symmetric regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(D; dx)$. For instance, if $(\mathcal{B}, D[\mathcal{B}])$ is defined by (7.4) with $\psi(x) = |x|^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and A_D is the operator associated with $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ then the solution of the problem

$$-A_D u = f$$

with $f \in L^2(D; dx)$ may be interpreted as a solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$-\Delta^\alpha u = f \text{ in } D, \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus D.$$

Let us recall that in the whole paper we assume that the forms under consideration satisfy $(\mathcal{E}.5)$, $(\mathcal{E}.6)$. We have already mentioned that the form defined by (7.5) satisfies

($\mathcal{E}$.5), i.e. is regular. It is known, that it satisfies ($\mathcal{E}$.6) if ψ^{-1} is locally integrable on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see [9, Example 1.5.2]).

For a given Hunt process $\mathbb{X}$ on E and an open set $D \subset E$ we denote by $\mathbb{X}^D$ the Hunt process on D which is a part of the process $\mathbb{X}$ on D (see [9, Appendix A.2] for details).

Proposition 7.2. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ defined by (7.5) satisfies Meyer's hypothesis (L). Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ and μ_n be defined by (7.1). Then $\mu_n \xrightarrow{uAF} \mu$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Let us first observe that the proof can be reduced to the case $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. This follows from the fact that if $\mathbb{X}$ is a Hunt process associated with the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ on $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and if A^μ is an additive functional of $\mathbb{X}^D$ associated with a smooth measure μ on D then

$$A^\mu_t = A^{\bar{\mu}}_{t\wedge\tau_D}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $A^{\bar{\mu}}$ is the additive functional of $\mathbb{X}$ associated with the measure $\bar{\mu}$ being the extension of μ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ by putting zero on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus D$.

Let $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$ and let $u_\varepsilon = j_\varepsilon * u$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{u}_\varepsilon(x) \cdot \bar{\hat{u}}_\varepsilon(x) \cdot \psi(x)\, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{u}|^2(x) \cdot |\hat{j_\varepsilon}|^2(x)\psi(x)\, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{u}|^2(x)\psi(x)\, dx = \mathcal{E}(u,u). \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Observe that for every $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$R_\alpha u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G_\alpha(x-y)u(y)\, dy = (G_\alpha * u)(x). \tag{7.7}$$

Hence

$$R_\alpha u_\varepsilon = G_\alpha * u_\varepsilon = G_\alpha * (u * j_\varepsilon) = j_\varepsilon * (G_\alpha * u) = j_\varepsilon * (R_\alpha u).$$

In particular, for every $u \in D(A)$, $j_\varepsilon * u \in D(A)$ and

$$-A(j_\varepsilon * u) = j_\varepsilon * (-Au). \tag{7.8}$$

Assume that $u \in D(A)$ and write $u_n = j_{1/n} * u$. Applying (7.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_n - u_m\|_{\mathcal{E}} = (-A(u_n - u_m), u_n - u_m) &= (j_{1/n} * (-Au) - j_{1/m} * (-Au), u_n - u_m) \\ &\leq 2\| - Au\|_{L^2}\|u_n - u_m\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $u_n \to u$ in $\mathcal{E}$. Now assume that $u \in D[\mathcal{E}]$. Then by (7.6),

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_n - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} &\leq \|u_n - j_{1/n} * (\alpha R_\alpha u)\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|j_{1/n} * (\alpha R_\alpha u) - \alpha R_\alpha u\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|\alpha R_\alpha u - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} \\ &\leq 2\|\alpha R_\alpha u - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|j_{1/n} * (\alpha R_\alpha u) - \alpha R_\alpha u\|_{\mathcal{E}}.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and then $\alpha \to \infty$ we conclude from the above inequality that $j_{1/n} * u \to u$ in $\mathcal{E}$. Finally, assume that $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Then there exists a sequence $\{u^k\} \subset D[\mathcal{E}]$ such that $\|u^k - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} \to 0$. Using once again (7.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_n - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} &= \|u_n - j_{1/n} * u^k\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|j_{1/n} * u^k - u^k\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{E}} \\ &\leq 2\|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|j_{1/n} * u^k - u^k\|_{\mathcal{E}}.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and then $k \to \infty$ shows that $j_{1/n} * u \to u$ in $\mathcal{E}$. Accordingly, for every $u \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$,

$$j_{1/n} * u \to u \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}. \tag{7.9}$$

Let $\mu \in S_0^{(0)}$ and let u_n, u be solutions of the problems

$$-Au_n = j_{1/n} * \mu, \quad -Au = \mu. \tag{7.10}$$

Then by (7.7),

$$u = R\mu, \quad u_n = R(j_{1/n} * \mu) = j_{1/n} * (R\mu).$$

Since $\mu \in S_0^{(0)}$, $R\mu \in D_e[\mathcal{E}]$. Therefore by (7.9),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|u_n - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = 0. \tag{7.11}$$

From this and [9, Lemma 5.1.1] it follows that for every $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\beta \in S_0^{(0)}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_\beta \sup_{t\ge 0} |u_n(X_t) - u(X_t)|^\alpha \le c(\alpha,\beta) \lim_{n\to\infty} \|u_n - u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = 0. \tag{7.12}$$

Now let u, u_n be solutions of (7.10) with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$. Let $\{F_k\}$ be a nest such that $\mathbf{1}_{F_k} \cdot \mu \in S_0^{(0)}$ for $k \ge 1$, and let u_n^k, u^k be solutions of

$$-Au_n^k = j_{1/n} * (\mathbf{1}_{F_k} \cdot \mu), \quad -Au^k = \mathbf{1}_{F_k} \cdot \mu. \tag{7.13}$$

From the probabilistic interpretation of equations (7.10), (7.13) and calculations leading to (5.9) it follows that for every $\beta \in S_{00}^{(0)}$ such that $\beta(E) = 1$ and every $q \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\beta \sup_{t\ge 0} |u_n^k(X_t) - u_n(X_t)|^q &\le c(q,\beta)\|\mu^k - \mu\|_{TV}, \\ E_\beta \sup_{t\ge 0} |u(X_t) - u^k(X_t)|^q &\le c(q,\beta)\|\mu^k - \mu\|_{TV}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

where $\mu^k = \mathbf{1}_{F_k} \cdot \mu$. For $u \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ put $|u|_{\sup}^{[q]} = E_\beta \sup_{t\ge 0} |u(X_t)|^q$. Then by (7.12) and (7.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} |u_n - u|_{\sup}^{[q]} &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} (|u_n - u_n^k|_{\sup}^{[q]} + |u_n^k - u^k|_{\sup}^{[q]} + |u^k - u|_{\sup}^{[q]}) \\ &\le 2c(q,\beta)\|\mu^k - \mu\|_{TV} + \lim_{n\to\infty} |u_n^k - u^k|_{\sup}^{[q]} \\ &= 2c(q,\beta)\|\mu^k - \mu\|_{TV}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ shows that $|u_n - u|_{\sup}^{[q]} \to 0$. The desired result now follows from Proposition 4.3. □

Combining Theorem 6.5 with Theorems 7.1 and 7.2 we get the following stability result.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ be the form defined by* (7.5) *such that* ($\mathcal{E}$.7) *and Meyer's hypothesis* (L) *are satisfied. Assume that g satisfies* (H), *$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$, μ_d is nontrivial and by u_n, u denote solutions of the problems*

$$\begin{aligned} -Au_n = g(u_n) \cdot (j_{1/n} * \mu), \quad u_n > 0, \\ -Au = g(u) \cdot \mu_d, \quad u > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

Then $u_n \to u$ in the topology of m-a.e. convergence as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 6.5 applied to the sequences $\{\mu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu_c\}$ and $\{\nu_n = j_{1/n} * \mu_d\}$. The assumptions of Theorem 6.5 for $\{\mu_n\}$ are satisfied by Theorem 7.1, whereas the assumptions for $\{\nu_n\}$ are satisfied thanks to Proposition 7.2. □

We see that in the limit equation (7.15) the whole concentrated part of μ disappear. This and the fact that (7.15) has a unique solution makes is legitimate to call u satisfying (7.15) the solution of (1.1). With this definition in mind, Theorem 7.3 may be viewed as an existence theorem for equation (1.1).

Acknowledgements

Research supported by National Science Centre Grant No. 2012/07/B/ST1/03508.

References

[1] S. Albeverio, G.W. Johnson, Z.-M. Ma, The Analytic Operator-Valued Feynman Integral via Additive Functionals of Brownian Motion, Acta Appl. Math. **42** (1996) 267–295.

[2] M.R. Blumenthal, R.K. Getoor, Markov Processes and Potential Theory. Dover Publications, New York, 2007.

[3] L. Boccardo, L. Orsina, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **37** (2010) 363–380.

[4] H. Brezis, A.C. Ponce, Reduced measures for obstacle problems. Adv. Differential Equations, **10** (2005) 1201–1234.

[5] Ph. Briand, B. Delyon, Y. Hu, E. Pardoux, L. Stoica, L^p solutions of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations, Stochastic Process. Appl. **108** (2003) 109–129.

[6] C. Dellacherie, P.A. Meyer, Probabilities and Potential, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.

[7] C. Dellacherie, P.A. Meyer, Probabilities and Potential C, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.

[8] L. Dupaigne, A.C. Ponce, Singularities of positive supersolutions in elliptic PDEs, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **10** (2004) 341–358.

[9] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, M. Takeda, Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes. Second revised and extended edition, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2011.

[10] J. Jacod, Convergence en loi de semimartingales et variation quadratique, Lecture Notes in Math. **850** (1981) 547–560.

[11] A. Jakubowski, Convergence in Various Topologies for Stochastic Integrals Driven by Semimartingales, Ann. Probab. **24** (1996) 2141–2153.

[12] A. Jakubowski, A Non-Skorohod Toplogy on the Skorohod Space, Electron. J. Probab. **2** (1997) no. 4, 21 pp.

[13] A. Jakubowski, J. Mémin, G. Pagès, Convergence en loi des suites d'intégrales stochastiques sur l'espace D^1. Probab. Theory Related Fields **81** (1989) 111–137.

[14] T. Klimsiak, Semi-Dirichlet forms, Feynman-Kac functionals and the Cauchy problem for semilinear parabolic equations, J. Funct. Anal. **268** (2015) 1205–1240.

[15] T. Klimsiak, Right Markov processes and systems of semilinear equations with measure data, Potential Anal. **44** (2016) 373–399.

[16] T. Klimsiak, A. Rozkosz, Dirichlet forms and semilinear elliptic equations with measure data, J. Funct. Anal. **265** (2013) 890–925.

[17] T. Klimsiak, A. Rozkosz, Semilinear elliptic equations with measure data and quasi-regular Dirichlet forms, Colloq. Math. **145** (2016) 35–67.

[18] V.A. Liskevich, Yu.A. Semenov, Some Inequalities for Submarkovian Generators and Their Applications to the Perturbation Theory, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **119** (1993) 1171–1177.

[19] Z.-M. Ma, M. Röckner, Introduction to the Theory of (Non-Symmetric) Dirichlet Forms, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[20] M. Marcus, A.C. Ponce, Reduced limits for nonlinear equations with measures, J. Funct. Anal. **258** (2010) 2316–2372.

[21] F. Murat, A. Porretta, Stability properties, existence and nonexistence of renormalized solutions for elliptic equations with measure data, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **27** (2002) 2267–2310.

[22] P. Protter, Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations. 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[23] J. Serrin, Pathological solutions of elliptic differential equations, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) **18** (1964) 385–387.

[24] M. Sharpe, General Theory of Markov Processes, Academic Press, New York, 1988.

[25] R.E. Showalter, Monotone Operators in Banach Space and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. Math. Surveys Monographs **49**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.